FOUNDED 1921

JUNE 1972

EDITOR R.PALME DUTT

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF LEFT UNITY · 20p

The Editor
Trade Unions' Testing Time

Alan Spence
Aircraft Industry

John Wood
Trade Unions and the Labour Party

Extra 10-page Special
Interview with Karl Marx

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Editor: R. Palme Dutt Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot

Managing Editor: Nicola Seyd

VOL. 54 No. 6 JUNE . 1972

CONTENTS

		Page
Notes of the Month: Trade Unions' Testing Time. *A New Challenge to Trade Unionism—Strength of Working Class Action—Dockers' Leading Role—Alice in Wonderland Logic—Who Said Dictatorship?—The New Star Chamber—Financial Terrorism—Victor Feather's Difficult Odyssey—'Within the Law'—Fight for the Future of Trade Unionism*	**R.P.D.**	241
Fifty Years Ago		251
Not So Easy As It Was. Cartoon by *Will Dyson*..		252
Trade Unions and the Labour Party	**John Wood**	253
Aircraft Industry Outlook	**Alan Spence**	255
Kwame Nkrumah	**Joan Bellamy**	260
Eleanor Marx	**Andrew Rothstein**	271
Iraq. New trends	**Mehdi Al-Hafidh**	273
In Honour of Georgi Dimitrov: How we Built Left Unity in Britain	**Isabel Brown**	277
Children's Books. Persistent indoctrination ..	**Nicola Seyd**	280
Singapore Anniversary. A memory of 1946..	**Peter Kingsford**	283
Book Reviews: 'The Formation of the Economic Thought of Karl Marx', Ernest Mandel: *Alexander Malysh*; 'The Siberians', Farley Mowat: *John Moss*; 'Lenin in His Own Words', Ernst Fischer and Franz Marek: *Conrad Wood*; 'Wicked, Wicked Libels', edited by Michael Rubinstein	**D. N. Pritt**	286
Doctor Marx	**Nicola Seyd**	292
Publications Received		Inside back cover

AN INTERVIEW WITH KARL MARX

Given to an American journalist in 1871—see pages 261-70

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

TRADE UNIONS' TESTING TIME

'He who does not wish to be the anvil must be the hammer.'
DIMITROV (quoting Goethe), concluding speech before the Reich Court in Leipzig, December 16, 1933.

May 15, 1972

On June 10 the Conference convened by the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions will have the task to mobilise the fight to defeat the heaviest offensive against trade unionism since the Combination Acts. When the miners won their historic victory on February 18, a victory made possible by the united working class solidarity demonstrated in the battle, including especially the active role of the engineers and railwaymen, alongside the support of students, housewives and other sections of the people, we described this victory in the April Notes as 'A Modern Red Friday'. The Tory Government of Heath, furious over the enforced surrender in face of the strength of working class unity, had nevertheless resisted the demands of their diehards for a fight to a finish in an unfavourable situation. They followed instead the strategy of Baldwin on Red Friday in 1925 to pay out under duress for the moment to buy time, in order immediately after, when their preparations were ready, to let loose the most ferocious offensive against the trade unions and enact new legislation to reduce them to submission. The corresponding offensive today is now fully launched. The offensive of Baldwin found expression in the operation to crush the general strike, with the aid and complicity of the reformist trade union leadership, and hamstring trade union rights by the Trade Union Act of 1927. But the 1927 Trade Union Act of Baldwin was a peashooter compared to the massive bombardment of the Industrial Relations Act of Heath in 1972.

A New Challenge to Trade Unionism

As soon as the decisive sections of the Industrial Relations Act became operative on February 28 this year, a success for the Government only made possible by the absence of united working class action to prevent the Bill becoming law, the National Industrial Relations Court was immediately constituted, under Sir John

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Donaldson as president, and with all the powers and privileges of a High Court, on the basis of the Act. As soon as the new Court began functioning in March, it immediately proceeded to pour out at break-neck speed a high-powered barrage of decisions, judgements, interventions, warnings, prohibitions and astronomical financial penalties, affecting all the normal operations of trade unions. No major union was too big, and no local factory incident too small, to escape its attention. Never was there such a Star Chamber, exercising simultaneously executive and judicial functions in a single institution with the most extraordinary powers to strike at the foundations of trade unionism and elementary trade union rights won by generations of struggle. This challenge to trade union rights by the Tory offensive and its institutional expression through the Court is conspicuous and plain.

Strength of Working Class Action

Yet even this direct institutional challenge is not the most serious aspect of the situation. However heavily armed and ferocious the offensive, there is no doubt that the united strength of the organised working class, representing in fact with their families and households the majority of the population, together with the wide support among professional and administrative representatives and technicians, and the broad range of progressive organisations, if mobilised for the full strength of united action, could defeat this offensive. Even the actions of those sections of organised workers who have refused to be terrorised by the threats of extraordinary powers and penalties, and who have in the face of decisions of the Court continued to pursue normal trade union actions, have demonstrated the problems arising for the Government and the Court to determine their future course of action when, despite their decisions and instructions, and after the imposing of successive draconian financial penalties on the national union leadership, the rank and file workers have continued their struggle, as in the case of the Merseyside dockers, or a courageous executive, as in the case of the TASS Executive of the Engineers in relation to the Newcastle situation, has upheld a local action in a factory to maintain a signed agreement against invasion by a union not affiliated to the TUC.

Dockers' Leading Role

The battle of the Merseyside dockers on the issue of the containers has illuminated the whole relationship of class forces. Any review of this battle will inevitably be outdated by the time it is read, since

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the situation is moving from day to day, both in respect of the action of the Court and the action of the dockers. But the record so far has already thrown a powerful light on the role of the Court and of the workers. At the outset, on the basis of a complaint by the firm that was being 'blacked', the Court began by issuing an order for this action to cease, and on this command being disregarded by the dockers, proceeded to impose successive fines totalling £55,000 on the national union leadership for 'contempt' because it had been unable to compel the dockers to obey the decision. Did this summary intervention of the Court with swingeing penalties lead the dockers to abandon their action? On the contrary. The intervention aggravated the conflict. The Merseyside dockers were joined by corresponding actions of the dockers in the overwhelming majority of ports in the country to 'black' the firm or firms concerned; and a national dockers' delegate conference gave 28 days notice of a national strike. The Government and the Court, having begun with peremptory orders which were not fulfilled, and having tried in vain to make the orders effective by imposing vast financial penalties on the national union leadership, without this bringing any cessation of the action of the dockers, now began to declare that the whole question of the docks and the containers was very complex and required further discussion, and that the dockers had a case which should be considered sympathetically. But if working class unity in action in this particular sphere, undeterred by threats and orders and penalties, could thus prove its strength and effectiveness to compel consideration of the issues and of the dockers' demands, then it is evident that the united strength of the ten millions of the organised working class, if mobilised in action, could completely defeat this anti-union offensive.

Double Challenge to Trade Unionism

But it is here that the most serious aspect of the situation has arisen. In face of the heaviest anti-union offensive since the Combination Acts, the ten-million strong organised trade union movement is paralysed from taking effective united action to defeat this threat to the very foundations of trade unionism, because it is divided on the key question whether to fight or capitulate. Not on the question of opposition to the Industrial Relations Act. All are united in proclaiming opposition and demanding its future repeal by a future Labour Government. But on the key question of present action while the anti-union offensive is in operation there is division. The majority of the General Council has moved along an inclined plane

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of successive retreats. In the initial stage, at the Special TUC in March of last year, a policy of absolute non-co-operation with the machinery of the Act (a policy which was agreed by all) received in the final voting test five-and-one-third million votes, as against close on four million votes representing the demand for action. Following this vote the entire millionaire press breathed a sigh of relief and expressed satisfaction over the victory of this 'moderate' alternative to action. At the next stage, after the Act had come into operation, the General Council majority modified the policy of absolute non-co-operation to recognise that, without prejudice to the principle of non-co-operation, unions should avail themselves of opportunities to argue their case before the Court. In the culminating stage of April 26, the General Council majority carried by close votes a recommendation for the payment of the £55,000 fines imposed by the Court, and approved of a proposed meeting of consultation of General Council members with the Tory Prime Minister at 10 Downing Street, which took place that evening, on the economy and industrial relations reforms. At this meeting arrangements were made for future regular consultation to continue, including with other Tory Ministers, on questions of the economy and the TUC's proposals for conciliation and arbitration machinery. No wonder the Government was delighted at this turn of events. After the first flick of the whip from the Court and the Act, Mondism was coming to life again. At the height of the anti-union offensive the fight against it has been replaced, in respect of the majority of the central union leadership, by the method of parleying with the Tory leader of the offensive, not on the basis of removal of the Act and the Court as the condition for negotiation, but while the axe of the Act and the Court continues in full operation. Thus the challenge to trade unionism at this moment has become a double challenge, not only from the direct Tory offensive but from dangerous divisions and capitulatory trends within the central union leadership. This is the serious situation which will require the most active fight of all the healthy forces of trade unionism to overcome.

Alice in Wonderland Logic

' "I'll be judge, I'll be jury," said cunning old Fury.' The new Star Chamber is so sudden and absolute in imposing draconian financial penalties for anything considered as 'contempt', that our poor little journal will need to be most reticent and mealy-mouthed in order not to find ourselves suddenly called on to pay a fine of half a million pounds, with a kindly General Council majority advising

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that we would do best to pay it. So we shall, following the path of safety, confine our remarks to Alice in Wonderland, where the principles set out are remarkably appropriate. Nothing could better express the hospitable invitation to innocent trade unionists to participate:

> How cheerfully he seems to grin,
> How neatly spread his claws,
> And welcomes little fishes in
> With gently smiling jaws.

Dominating all is the perfect exemplar of the Queen, embodying the principle of 'sentence first—verdict afterwards'. 'The Queen had only one way of settling all difficulties, great or small. "Off with his head!" she said, without even looking round.' 'They're dreadfully fond of beheading people here: the great wonder is that there's anyone left alive.' And who cannot recognise the pliant features of a majority member of the General Council?

> When the sands are all dry, he is gay as a lark,
> And will talk in contemptuous tones of the Shark:
> But, when the tide rises and sharks are around,
> His voice has a timid and tremulous sound.

No wonder he is 'timid and tremulous', for overall hangs the threat of the Industrial—beg pardon, the Jabberwock. 'Beware the Jabberwock, my son! The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!' But in the end there is a power that is stronger than the Queen and the Jabberwock. That power is the active fight of mankind represented by Alice.

> The Queen turned crimson with fury, and, after glaring at her for a moment like a wild beast, screamed 'Off with her head! Off—'
> 'Nonsense!' said Alice, very loudly and decidedly, and the Queen was silent.

'You shan't be beheaded,' said Alice to the three gardeners sentenced by the Queen, and Alice saved them. Equally the Jabberwock was finally slain by the brave boy, and universal popular rejoicing followed.

> 'And hast thou slain the Jabberwock!
> Come to my arms, my beamish boy!
> O frabjous day! Callooh! Callay!'
> He chortled in his joy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So in the true mythology of Alice in Wonderland and the Looking Glass fighting mankind finally overcomes the terrors and the spectres. The principle is not without bearing for the problems of trade unionism today.

Who Said Dictatorship?

Lenin remarked in his lecture on 'The State' in 1919 that, while 'the bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage—all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society,' nevertheless even in the most democratic republic (and he instanced the United States where 'the power of a handful of multi-millionaires over the whole of society' is 'crude' and 'openly corrupt'), 'once capital exists it dominates the whole of society, and no democratic republic, no electoral law can change the essence of the matter.' But in the familiar type of parliamentary democracy the principal traditional public organs are presented under a thick coating of camouflage to hide the realities of class dictatorship. Parliament is presented as the sovereign voice of the will of the people. The Government is presented, not as the executive organ of the big monopolists, landlords and rentiers, but as the representative of 'the community' and 'the nation' against sectional interests. The High Courts are presented with an aura of reverence and mystery as remote and independent from the Government, a pure fountain of justice.

The New Star Chamber

But with the establishment of the Industrial Relations Court all these traditional forms of concealment of the reality of class dictatorship receive scant respect. The Executive and the Judiciary are combined into a single organ with extraordinary powers to deal summarily with recalcitrant trade unionists. It is true that Sir John Donaldson proclaimed that his 'Industrial Court' was 'a court of law' and 'as such independent of the Government and in no way connected with its policies.' But in the first major national industrial dispute brought before the Court, that of the railwaymen, his judgement made explicitly clear that his supposedly 'independent' Court could only carry out the will of the Government. When the Minister for Employment called on the Court to issue an order holding up the railwaymen's industrial action, the Court judgement declared that on two of the three grounds on which such an order could be issued the Court could only act as an instrument of the Minister: 'It is not for us to agree or disagree with his views, for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Section 18 of the Act provides that, so far as these two conditions are concerned, it is his view and not ours which counts.' Why then establish a separate Court if it is thus in reality an administrative instrument of the Government? Because a High Court, with its traditional grandeur of sacrosanct omnipotent authority, whose will none may question, can intervene like the Lord God Almighty in the whole tangled web of industrial relations to impose at will (and with the only appeal to a precisely similar body of high legal luminaries) judgements and orders and extraordinary penalties for 'contempt', with the possibility of limitless catastrophic multiplication and repetition, all to be unquestioningly accepted, while the Government escapes the odium of directly imposing such astounding penal measures against the trade unions.

Financial Terrorism

The principal weapon of the Court is not the jailer or the machine gun. It is true that in the final analysis the method of imprisonment is included in the armoury: as the Solicitor General said on February 23, 1971, in the parliamentary debate on the Bill: 'If in the last resort somebody is determined to continue defying an order made in a situation defined in this Bill, then he cannot be kept out of prison.' But this old fashioned method is not the main weapon at present. The new technique devised is to strike at the finances of the unions, that is, at all that has been built up by the pence of the workers to equip themselves for some measure of protection in the struggle for existence in the conditions of capitalist industry. The imposing of the £5,000 fine on the Transport and General Workers' Union, and then the multiplication of it at the next stage to £55,000 was only a foretaste of what the Act provides. The Act provides for penalties of £100,000 on any union with over 100,000 members (and this applies to 80 per cent of trade union membership); and this need not end as a single fine, but can be repeated for every day that the offence of refusing to obey an order continues. When the cumulative fine £55,000 was imposed, the warning was added that if the offence continued and the fine was not paid, the next step might be to 'sequestrate' the entire finances, amounting to £22 million, of the union. That is why it was so unwise to pay the Danegeld of £55,000 in place of facing the inevitable battle for union rights and independence. The whip of financial terror is used in order to cow moderate, cautious, law-abiding trade union officials into the slippery morass of retreat and surrender. But the example of the dockers, or the engineers in the North-West area has shown

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the workers on the shop floor have not been similarly cowed to surrender by the threat to union finances, but have recognised the necessity of the fight; and this has applied also in the case of those unions whose democratic functioning has given the fullest scope for the expression of the will of the workers in industry. Here the contrast between the dangerous capitulatory trends of the General Council majority and the real situation in industry and the developing battle is a powerful pointer to the problems and tasks of the present stage. And it is for this reason that the most intense drive of the present anti-union offensive is directed against the rights of the shop stewards, so that, despite the present problems of divisions in the central union leadership, the factory front is today the visible key front of the fight.

Victor Feather's Difficult Odyssey

Nothing has more faithfully reflected the shifting quandaries of a large proportion of the trade union official world in face of the offensive of the Act and the Court than the successive utterances of that most faithful spokesman of the General Council, and at the moment target of the Government's abuse, Victor Feather. At the outset, immediately after the Act and the Court came into operation, he was gaily confident that its operation would amount to zero:

> Officially, legally the Industrial Relations Act is in operation. In practice it scarcely exists.

That was on March 16. Within a few days the jaws began to close. On March 22 the General Council had suspended the National Union of Seamen for violating TUC decisions by registering under the Act. A warning followed from the Court that this suspension could not be permitted. On March 29 the first fine of £5,000 was imposed on the Transport Workers. The declarations of Victor Feather now expressed disillusionment, as he had thus discovered that his supposedly ineffective Court had become 'the Old Bailey'. On April 23 he complained:

> We were led to believe that this was more of a tribunal than a court with all the obligations due to the Old Bailey.

By April 26 there followed the major retreat of the General Council majority, with the recommendation for the payment of the com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pounded fine of £55,000 by the Transport Workers (by a reported vote of 16 to 14), and rejection of a demand for a boycott of the planned meeting of the General Council with Mr Heath that evening (by a reported majority of 21 to 19). Following this retreat of the majority, in his speech at Cardiff on April 29 Victor Feather returned to the line of generalised optimistic confidence without strategic detail, declaring that the Act would 'prove to bring the downfall of the Government' and appealing for unity among trade unionists in opposition to the Act. Next day in an article in a Sunday newspaper he observed:

> Trade Unionists have always worked within the law. We knew that the Industrial Relations Act was the law of the land—nobody had to tell us that.
> I think everybody expected that voluntary methods would be given a good chance to sort things out before the law was brought in.
> In fact this Court is just as much a court as the Old Bailey.
>
> (Victor Feather, feature article in *News of the World*, April 30, 1972.)

'Trade unionists have always worked within the law.' Shades of Tolpuddle.

'Within the Law'

'Trade unionists have always worked within the law.' The very rights of existence of trade unionism were won by defying the class law which initially sought to ban any organisation of workers; and then, when the strength of the illegal organisations of workers compelled the first recognition of trade union rights, has ever since sought by every legal device and formula, right up to the present Industrial Relations Act, to restrict and hamper those trade union rights.

> We are a Movement founded on dissent with a long history of opposition to Governments and their efforts to destroy us. We have been forced many times to operate outside the law to maintain our very existence. We have not made that long and dangerous journey to allow a Tory Government in 1972 to achieve what so many of its predecessors have tried so often to do before.
>
> Jim Conway, General Secretary of the AUEW Engineering Section in the May issue of its journal.

But indeed the very decisions of last year's Special TUC, the 7-point resolution which won the majority against the 45 per cent vote for militant industrial action, and which was claimed to represent the 'moderate' policy 'within the law', in fact involved, if its terms were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carried out, defiance of the Industrial Relations Act and breach of the law. We exposed this contradiction at the time in the April Notes under the heading 'The Slippery Slope To Surrender'; and the text of this warning is worth reproducing today since it has been so notably confirmed by the subsequent experience:

> The weakness in the position of the advocates of the compromise formula is that they have failed to face the consequences of their own policy. At the same time as they emphasise the importance of keeping within the law, and assert that the Bill will inevitably become the law, they make pledges of non-co-operation in the machinery established by the Act once it is brought into operation. But the fulfilment of these pledges of non-co-operation would inevitably mean, if carried out, defiance of the law (e.g. the fourth recommendation, to continue to deal with inter-union disputes in accordance with the Bridlington procedure established by the TUC, in place of accepting the new statutory authority established to deal with such questions); and such defiance could involve the unions concerned with liability to the financial penalties laid down as 'damages' of £100,000 to be paid by unions with over 100,000 members for every offence against the enforced industrial code. If this procedure to bankrupt the unions is resisted, the fight will be on, despite all the desire to keep within the law, but at a later stage, under more unfavourable conditions than before the Bill is law, when there is still the opportunity for the trade unions to use their industrial strength to compel the Government to withdraw the Bill. Hence the path of would-be compromise either leads to the inevitable fight later but under more unfavourable conditions, or, by its own logic, leads to extending and eventually unlimited surrender.

This prediction of the outcome of the resolution adopted at the Special TUC has been borne out by the record of the past year leading up to the retreat of April 26.

Fight for the Future of Trade Unionism

The spokesmen of the demand for militant industrial action to defeat the anti-union legislation made clear that they knew that the effectiveness of such action would depend on the mobilisation of the united strength of the entire trade union movement. Thus Hugh Scanlon declared on April 19, 1971:

> Any effective attempt to make this legislation inoperable can only flow from a tactical refusal by all trade unions either to register or to seek registration. Such a united front, if carried through, would destroy the effects of such legislation.

But in the same statement he pointed out that the actual division of the unions on the issue was opening the way to defeat:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The movement is in effect disunited and in disarray when faced with a serious test. This is not mincing words—but then this is not the time to mince words.

The vote against industrial strike action shows a reluctance to mobilise trade unionists for a serious and concerted struggle against the Bill.

The justification of this warning was shown in the subsequent successive concessions and modifications of policy culminating in the full retreat of April 26. But this does not mean that the struggle is thereby over. The continuing offensive of the Act and the Court will deal its further blows at the unions, and again and again present the harsh choice between further surrenders or resistance. The task now is to rally the fullest strength of trade unionism, including those sections still hoping to keep 'within the law', to face the reality of the inevitable struggle for the whole future of trade unionism. For this purpose the speediest convening of a Special Trades Union Congress, as now pressed for by so many bodies of the trade union movement, becomes of vital urgency.

R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY FIFTY YEARS AGO

I know that we are not going to end capitalism by Poplar methods. It is for the workers through their national organisations to put an end to the system of wage-slavery and exploitation. All that is claimed on behalf of Poplar is that the policy pursued there is the only sound policy for Labour representatives on local authorities who mean to stand by the workers through good report and ill, and that to oppose it is to oppose the openly proclaimed policy of the labour movement.

The issue that is raised by Poplar is larger than an issue of local government. It is the whole question whether the labour movement means business. Are we going to attempt to carry out what we say on the platform, or are we to be misled and side-tracked by considerations of 'statesmanship'. I have no doubt of the answer of the rank-and-file members of the labour movement. We all need to stand together, and not to waste time belittling and decrying one another's work. That is why I deplore the attacks which have been made against our work by some friends in high places in the movement, and which have compelled me to write this article.

(From 'Poplar and the Labour Party: A Defence of Poplarism', by George Lansbury, *Labour Monthly*, June 1922).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOT SO EASY AS IT WAS

THE BOSS: "Phew! The fellers who tied these sticks together knew something!"

On Shakespeare's birthday, April 23, 1914, the National Union of Railwaymen, the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, and the National Transport Workers' Federation instructed their six principal officers to work out the plan for the Triple Industrial Alliance. Welcomed by militants, dreaded by reactionaries, exercising influence over governments, it lasted for seven years until its collapse through the betrayal by J. H. Thomas. Will Dyson's cartoon appeared in the *Daily Herald* in 1914.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS AND THE LABOUR PARTY

John Wood*

AS a long standing reader of *Labour Monthly*, I would like to express my congratulations to Ernie Roberts, for his outspoken attitude to the trade unions in Britain in their relationship to the Labour Party (*LM*, May 1972). He is correct to bring out the weakness of the relations between the trade unions and the Labour Party, which historically in Britain is the child of the trade union movement, and which he claims should be controlled by the trade unions, but that this control should be 'control with power'. He brings out the important role the trade union members could play in the local Labour Parties right through the political apparatus to the final forum, the national Labour Party Conference.

However, he fails to bring out a very important element which is missing in the relationship of the trade unions and the Labour Party, and that is that the trade unions have not the right to send to any section of the Labour Party, from local Party to the national Conference, the delegates of their choice. The only trade union members eligible to attend these bodies are individual members of the Labour Party.

While it is correct to say that 'six million' of the country's voters are trade unionists, affiliated through their trade unions to the national Labour Party and also to their local Constituency Labour Party, the vast majority of these trade union members are denied their inherent right to represent their affiliated views in these functioning parts of the Labour Party.

The Labour Party has two types of bans and proscriptions, namely, the trade union member who is not an individual member of the Labour Party, thus banning many good trade unionists; and the member of the Communist Party who is an affiliated member of the Labour Party.

Ernie Roberts says: 'The trade union movement, representing the working class, *is* the Labour Party—in the sense that trade

---

* John Wood was, until his retirement in 1965, the General Secretary of the Scottish Area of the National Union of Mineworkers; he is a member of the National Executive of the Scottish Old Age Pensioners' Association, and President of its Edinburgh Area Council.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unions breathe financial life into the Party,' and so I claim that, on this correct statement of fact, it must also be accepted that it is absolutely undemocratic to deny to millions of trade unionists their inherent right to be appointed as delegates and representatives of their respective trade unions, to any section or part of the Labour Party functioning apparatus.

I read that the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs at their recent Conference have called for the removal of bans and proscriptions from the Labour Party, and I express the opinion that all progressive and militant trade unions must follow suit, if we as trade unionists are to see Ernie Roberts's vision of a socialist Britain.

When I claim it is the inherent right of every trade unionist to be a part and an accepted part of the Labour Party, as a part of the whole labour movement of Britain, I do so on the basis that in the beginning this was so, and that the bans and proscriptions are the result of the machinations of the right wing of the Labour Party and the labour movement over the years. Ernie Roberts says: 'All the faults of the Party, and its repeated failures to implement socialist policies, can be laid at the door of those who ought to control the Labour Party—the trade unions,' but I would like to amend that statement by saying it is the right wing of the trade unions.

In doing so, however, I must make it clear that if the trade unions fail to accept the call of Ernie Roberts for 'control with power' then they must accept the statement he makes, that 'repeated failures to implement socialist policies can be laid at their doors.' The demand should therefore be loud and clear: cast out the policy of bans and proscriptions from the constitution of trade unions and Labour Party, and reintroduce the policy of full rights in the trade unions, and full rights for all affiliated trade union members in the Labour Party.

It is on the basis of these inherent rights and unity in action that we will begin to see the goal which Ernie Roberts is calling for, the control of the Labour Party by the trade unions, and that it must be 'control with power'. I could then agree with him when he says: 'If these things are done, the trade unions can play a leading role in the creation of a socialist party in which the delegates to the Annual Conference, the National Executive Committee, the Parliamentary Labour Party and the Party leadership will be united in their efforts to destroy the present capitalist society and replace it with a socialist one.'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY OUTLOOK

Alan Spence*

MAY Day 1972 saw the largest demonstration for many years parading through the streets of Preston, Lancashire. Dominating in numbers were the 3,500 workers of the British Aircraft Corporation's Preston Division who had been on strike for over three months.

During the past three years, wages—apart from meagre national awards—have almost stood still. To remedy this a claim for an immediate 12½ per cent increase was submitted. The management countered with 8 per cent and a revised wage-structure offer. Rejected at mass meetings, it precipitated the longest strike in the company's history. The obduracy of the strikers is brought into focus when one has the perspective of the wage-structure the management intend to impose, and the method they applied to 'soften-up' the workers in preparation for this struggle.

Over the past years construction has steadily developed on a new warplane, the Jaguar, being produced in conjunction with the French firm of Dassault-Breguet. Throughout this period the management have refused to enter into piecework prices and the work has been done on lieu rates, i.e. a fixed percentage of the average piecework earned elsewhere in the factory. As the old orders were finished and the workers transferred to the new plane, wages became static. By 1971 they were on average £5 a week less than they would have been if *pro rata* proportions with other factories in the district, still on traditional piecework, had been maintained.

BAC (owned by GEC, Vickers and Rolls Royce) had a policy which was deliberate and decided—to break with the old method of individual piecework and introduce fixed wages with an annual review. Recognising that to take on all the factories in their aircraft empire would be too difficult, they agreed to pay the very same claim at Bristol, to accept the principle of mutual agreement of prices at Weybridge, and to drag out discussions elsewhere.

---

* Alan Spence was formerly Chairman Joint Shop Stewards Committee BAC Preston Division, Secretary BAC Combine Committee, and a member of the AUEW National Aircraft Advisory Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus isolated, Preston, they believed, would soon crack. Then would come the turn of the others.

And in waging this struggle BAC were not only flying their particular profitability kite, but were also carrying out the general strategy of their monopoly finance masters to end the piecework system, for by turning it to their advantage the shop stewards had so eaten into profits that, left unchecked, it would have put the capitalist system itself into jeopardy. With the growth in organised power at the point of production shop stewards were able to manipulate piecework so that wages constantly moved upwards.

Managements, on the whole, were helpless against this trend, for refusal to pay the desired price for that individual job was met by a strike within the particular section or shop, and, facing disrupted production throughout the rest of the workplace, it was easier to pay up. It was this method of struggle which led to the doubling of strikes in the 1960s, though the number of days on strike hardly changed.

Through the control of this mechanism, the working class was able to redistribute the ratio of national income in its favour. In 1964 wages and salaries took 68.7 per cent of the national income whilst profit had 14.8 per cent. By 1970 profit was down to 9.7 per cent whilst wages and salaries were up to 72.1 per cent.

Against this crisis background monopoly capitalism, having lost the internal struggle in the workplace, decided through the Industrial Relations Act and the Courts to call in the external forces of the state; introduce a wage freeze, particularly in the public sector; get a substantial cash flow into their coffers through uninhibited price rises; and to wage unremitting war against the piecework system.

In this latter aspect BAC has been spurred on by the criticism of the Elstub Committee set up to examine productivity in the aircraft industry. They showed that the 'learning curve' in production was utilised by the workers: they insisted upon fixed prices at an early stage of production, and then, as skills improved, took advantage of this to boost their earnings. British practice was unique and, for example, they examined the Swedish practice of moving targets higher as skill improved, or that in America, where they depended upon intensive supervision.

International comparisons began to loom very much in the foreground. It would surely not have gone unnoticed that the West German practice of fixed wages enabled German capitalism to improve the distribution of the national income to their advantage

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year after successive year, and in 1969 alone it swung against the working class by over 4 per cent.

This international perspective underpins the attitude which has come to dominate the industry since the Plowden Report saw future production in collaboration with other countries. It stressed the fact that aircraft were becoming so expensive that only the largest industrial countries with their vast internal markets—such as the Soviet Union and the US—could take on these tasks. Though this proposition is no doubt true as a generalisation, it may not be true in the particular. And it was this 'particular' that the Labour Government overlooked when last in office.

Taking the then overwhelming dominance of the US aircraft industry as eternal, wanting to assure the EEC of their good faith, and the growing expense of aircraft in a situation of acute balance of payments problems, the Labour Government was led into a policy which almost decimated the industry's future and certainly created serious damage.

The prime mover in this was Roy Jenkins, the then Minister of Aviation, whose disastrous course through the labour movement expressed itself long before his recent antics kept the Tories in office. He failed to recognise that a balance-sheet was but the quantitative measurement of a particular historical segment, and its properties could not disclose the internal essence of an industry for which a technological perspective was needed. He stopped further new production of the VC-10 and the Belfast, scrapped the TSR-2, attempted to stop Concorde and stifled incipient designs.

How wrong he was has since been proved by the commerical success of those VC-10s which did get into service. Had his judgement been sound he would have sold BOAC's Boeings and replaced them with VC-10s. His decision to purchase the US Hercules, in preference to the Belfast heavy freighter, for the RAF halted a promising project for the 'Jumbo' market which has since appeared. And only the French Government's decision to sue if Concorde was cancelled saved it from an early grave. As regards the TSR-2 warplane, if he and the Labour Government had gone on to scrap the capitalist system, no one would then have objected—but they didn't. They purchased combat aircraft from the US and entered into production agreements with EEC members. As much as £600 million was spent in America on Hercules, Phantoms and the aborted F-111, mostly in dollars and non-recoverable, whereas from production in this country 40 per cent of the expenditure would have recycled its way back to the Treasury via taxation—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more if services supplied by the nationalised industries are included.

This hold of the US warplanes in industry grows ever tighter: the book value of the RAF's 3,795 planes is about £2,000 million of which 70 per cent is British and 26 per cent American. By 1980 book value will be about £5,000 million of which 37 per cent will be British, 42 per cent US and the rest EEC.

Subsequently the Labour Government went into joint production with the French of the Jaguar, with an order for 200 at £1.5 million each, and then commenced work with Fiat in Italy, Messerschmitt in Germany—and probably France will join—in the largest, single, industrial undertaking ever ventured in Western Europe: the £2,000 million Multi-Role-Combat aircraft project.

Against these figures the £50 million a year the Concorde has cost comes into rational perspective. In fact, considering that Britain's civil transport moves 5¼ million passengers on domestic routes and 8½ million on international ones, for a total expenditure of £350 million (though, of course, their revenue exceeds this and they make a profit), this only emphasises capitalism's capacity to squander public funds on private class objectives. Even if Concorde becomes a failure—and all the indications are that it will become a triumph to man's creative ability—it will be more worthy than providing replacements for the 75 planes the services crash a year (749 since 1962 with 552 aircrew killed), which prompts a parody on the old ditty: 'New warplanes never die, they're simply pranged away.'

Even if the £1,000 million (France and Britain 50 per cent each) cost of the Concorde is dwarfed by military expenditure, nevertheless, it is still an enormous sum of money. Therefore reason and technology suggest that it lends itself to co-production. For it does, furthermore, coincide with the fact that the international division of labour is the world's fastest growing commodity.

In Europe this is accentuated by the development of common markets. In the EEC, the most aggressive monopoly capitalists are interlocking their activities so that a new phenomenon is beginning to appear: the trans-national capitalist whose economic basis is not a national one, but multi-national.

The aerospace industry spearheads this movement. Apart from the French, German and Italian combinations already mentioned, we find the formation of the ATLAS group (Air France, Lufthansa, Alitalia); Europlane (BAC, MBB—Germany, Saab, Scania—Sweden); and the just emerging company of RR Snecma, MTU, Volvo and Fiat, for joint engine production. Of course nationalism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is far from dead; in particular the French enthusiasm to assert their national preference, is a cause of much wrangling, but a new pattern is clearly emerging.

And this situation holds new dangers for the working class. For each national capitalist will squeeze his own labour force to extract the maximum profit to give him the best position for juggling in the new power structure. And in this light British capitalism does not at present shine, for it has been notoriously inefficient at generating economic growth and capital. Because of this they stand in comparative disadvantage with French and German capitalism.

However all is not lost for Britain's capitalists for though the continental capitalists have higher growth rates, this success has enabled their working class to win higher wages than their British counterparts. For example French skilled fitters get £35 per week against the £28 paid at Preston; and machinists obtain £30 against £24. Nor is productivity any worse. France has perhaps a 1-2 per cent advantage, but this is due to the larger orders which the persistent determination of the French to obtain a leading position in aerospace ordained: and they programmed their designs and orders to this objective. Therefore, if wages can be kept depressed it will compensate for deficiencies elsewhere.

It is in this setting of complex influences that the workers at Preston are waging their struggle, in appearance just another battle for a wage increase, but in essence part of the new path capitalism is trying to tread.

But it will fail. For workers are resolved never to become subservient to a supra-capitalist, multi-national war machine. They demand that production be for the enrichment of society. To this end the strike of BAC at Preston is creating that property of militancy which, expressed through the technical expertise and sound understanding of workers and the aerospace intelligentsia, will establish an aircraft industry pledged to human betterment.

Labour Monthly Bound Volumes

Our price list is available on enquiry

Have you ordered your volume for 1971 at the reduced price?

See outside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KWAME NKRUMAH

Joan Bellamy*

DR Kwame Nkrumah died, aged 63, on April 27, in Romania, where he was receiving medical treatment. Kwame Nkrumah will always be remembered as an outstanding historical figure who led the way in winning the independence of Ghana. A man of immense personal charm, he devoted his great intellectual and organising abilities to liberating Ghana from neo-colonialist domination, and to the liberation and unity of the African continent.

He formed the Convention People's Party in 1949, breaking away from the United Gold Coast Convention, to campaign for immediate self-government. Appealing to the mass of the people, over the heads of tribal and sectional leaders, he created a great mass movement for independence which mounted strikes, boycotts and massive demonstrations. Attlee's Labour Government imprisoned him for fourteen months, but, elected to represent Accra in the Legislative Assembly by the biggest vote ever recorded, he was released to become leader of the first new internal self-Government. Full independence followed in 1957 and Dr Nkrumah developed policies aimed at overcoming the effects of colonialism and at breaking the grip of neo-colonialism on the economic and national life of his country. The state of Ghana became a dynamic centre of the struggle for African unity and the total liberation of the continent. After initial concessions to anti-Communist pressures he moved increasingly towards Marxism and stronger relations with the socialist countries.

His Government was overthrown by a military coup in February 1966 when he was *en route* for Hanoi. Ghana was facing serious economic problems and there were deep differences between various sections of the Convention People's Party. Dr Nkrumah probably over-estimated his capacity for maintaining Party unity and retaining the personal loyalties of some long-standing colleagues.

Hated by the imperialists he was a mass political figure of great prestige in his own country and the rest of Africa. Whatever immediate developments unfold in Ghana, the effect of his achievements and the power of his ideas will long be a determining factor in Ghanaian politics and, indeed, throughout the rest of the continent.

* Joan Bellamy worked in Ghana, and was a member of the editorial staff of the *Spark*, founded by Dr Nkrumah as a journal of scientific socialism for Africa.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN INTERVIEW WITH KARL MARX

An interview with Karl Marx published in the New York World *on July 18, 1871, from its correspondent R. Landor (and reprinted a month later in* Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly) *has never since been reprinted until the valuable initiative in their spring issue this year of the US Journal* Science & Society, *to whom we express acknowledgement.*

We are pleased to provide our readers with the full text. It is of especial interest, not only because it reveals Marx at the height of his powers, immediately after the Paris Commune, dealing with questions of the widest significance in connection with the working class, the International and the Commune, and with the questions of the path to the victory of the working class in Britain, but also because it demonstrates his mastery to present his conceptions in the simplest form to an inquiring representative of the general public, yet with complete clarity and scientific precision and revolutionary confidence in the principles he expresses. Ed. *LM.*

London, July 3.—You have asked me to find out something about the International Association, and I have tried to do so. The enterprise is a difficult one just now. London is indisputably the headquarters of the association, but the English people have got a scare, and smell International in everything as King James smelt gunpowder after the famous plot. The consciousness of the society has naturally increased with the suspiciousness of the public; and if those who guide it have a secret to keep, they are of the stamp of men who keep a secret well. I have called on two of their leading members, have talked with one freely, and I here give you the substance of my conversation. I have satisfied myself of one thing, that it is a society of genuine working men, but that these workmen are directed by social and political theorists of another class. One man whom I saw, a leading member of the council, was sitting at his workman's bench during our interview, and left off talking to me from time to time to receive a complaint, delivered in no courteous tone, from one of the many little masters in the neighbourhood who employed him. I have heard this same man make eloquent speeches in public inspired in every passage with the energy of hate towards the classes that call themselves his rulers. I understood the speeches after this glimpse at the domestic life of the orator. He must have felt that he had brains enough to have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organised a working-government, and yet here he was obliged to devote his life to the most revolting task work of a mechanical profession. He was proud and sensitive, and yet at every turn he had to return a bow for a grunt and a smile for a command that stood on about the same level in the scale of civility with a huntsman's call to his dog. This man helped me to a glimpse of one side of the nature of the International, the revolt of labour against capital, of the workman who produces against the middleman who enjoys. Here was the hand that would smite hard when the time came, and as to the head that plans, I think I saw that, too, in my interview with Dr Karl Marx.

Dr Karl Marx is a German doctor of philosophy with a German breadth of knowledge derived both from observation of the living world and from books. I should conclude that he has never been a worker in the ordinary sense of the term. His surroundings and appearance are those of a well-to-do man of the middle class. The drawing-room into which I was ushered on the night of my interview would have formed very comfortable quarters for a thriving stockbroker who had made his competence and was now beginning to make his fortune. It was comfort personified, the apartment of a man of taste and of easy means, but with nothing in it peculiarly characteristic of its owner. A fine album of Rhine views on the table, however, gave a clue to his nationality. I peered cautiously into the vase on the side-table for a bomb. I sniffed for petroleum, but the smell was the smell of roses. I crept back stealthily to my seat, and moodily awaited the worst.

He has entered and greeted me cordially, and we are sitting face to face. Yes, I am *tête à tête* with the revolution incarnate, with the real founder and guiding spirit of the International Society, with the author of the address in which capital was told that if it warred on labour it must expect to have its house burned down about its ears—in a word, with the apologist for the Commune of Paris. Do you remember the bust of Socrates, the man who died rather than profess his belief in the gods of the time—the man with the fine sweep of profile for the forehead running meanly at the end into a little snub, curled-up feature like a bisected pothook that formed the nose? Take this bust in your mind's eye, colour the beard black, dashing it here and there with puffs of grey; clap the head thus made on a portly body of the middle height, and the Doctor is before you. Throw a veil over the upper part of the face and you might be in the company of a born vestryman. Reveal the essential feature, the immense brow, and you know at once that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you have to deal with that most formidable of all composite forces —a dreamer who thinks, a thinker who dreams.

Another gentleman, accompanied Dr Marx, a German too, I believe, though from his great familiarity with our language I cannot be sure of it.[1] Was he a witness on the doctor's side? I think so. The 'Council',[2] hearing of the interview, might hereafter call on the Doctor for his account of it, for the *Revolution* is above all things suspicious of its agents. Here, then, was his evidence in corroboration.

I went straight to my business. The world, I said, seemed to be in the dark about the International, hating it very much, but not able to say clearly what thing it hated. Some, who professed to have peered further into the gloom than their neighbours, declared that they had made out a sort of Janus figure with a fair, honest workman's smile on one of its faces, and on the other a murderous, conspirator's scowl. Would he light up the case of mystery in which the theory dwelt?

The professor laughed, chuckled a little I fancied, at the thought that we were so frightened of him. 'There is no mystery to clear up, dear sir,' he began, in a very polished form of the Hans Breitmann dialect, 'except perhaps the mystery of human stupidity in those who perpetually ignore the fact that our association is a public one and that the fullest reports of its proceedings are published for all who care to read them. You may buy our rules for a penny, and a shilling laid out in pamphlets will teach you almost as much about us as we know ourselves.

R.—Almost—yes, perhaps so; but will not the something I shall not know constitute the all-important reservation? To be quite frank with you, and to put the case as it strikes an outside observer, this general claim of depreciation of you must mean something more than the ignorant ill-will of the multitude. And it is still pertinent to ask, even after what you have told me, what is the International Society?

Dr M.—You have only to look at the individuals of which it is composed—workmen.

R.—Yes, but the soldier need be no exponent of the statecraft that sets him in motion. I know some of your members, and I can believe that they are not of the stuff of which conspirators are

[1] The other 'gentleman' was probably Frederick Engels who was also in London, and often went to Marx's house.

[2] The 'Council' was the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association, its leading body which met weekly in London and corresponded with workers' groups in other countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made. Besides, a secret shared by a million men would be no secret at all. But what if these were only the instruments in the hands of a bold, and I hope you will forgive me for adding, not over-scrupulous conclave.

Dr M.—There is nothing to prove it.

R.—The last Paris insurrection?

Dr M.—I demand firstly the proof that there was any plot at all—that anything happened that was not the legitimate effect of the circumstances of the moment; or, the plot granted, I demand the proofs of the participation in it of the International Association.

R.—The presence in the communal body of so many members of the association.

Dr M.—Then it was a plot of the Freemasons, too, for their share in the work as individuals was by no means a slight one. I should not be surprised, indeed, to find the Pope setting down the whole insurrection to their account. But try another explanation. The insurrection in Paris was made by the workmen of Paris. The ablest of the workmen must necessarily have been its leaders and administrators; but the ablest of the workmen happen also to be members of the International Association. Yet the association as such may in no way be responsible for their action.

R.—It will still seem otherwise to the world. People talk of secret instructions from London, and even grants of money. Can it be affirmed that the alleged openness of the association's proceedings precludes all secrecy of communication?

Dr M.—What association ever formed carried on its work without private as well as public agencies? But to talk of secret instruction from London, as of decrees in the matter of faith and morals from some centre of Papal domination and intrigue, is wholly to misconceive the nature of the International. This would imply a centralised form of government of the International, whereas the real form is designedly that which gives the greatest play to local energy and independence. In fact the International is not properly a government for the working class at all. It is a bond of union rather than a controlling force.

R.—And of union to what end?

Dr M.—The economical emancipation of the working class by the conquest of political power. The use of that political power to the attainment of social ends. It is necessary that our aims should be thus comprehensive to include every form of working class activity. To have made them of a special character would have been to adapt them to the needs of one section—one nation of workmen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone. But how could all men be asked to unite to further the objects of a few? To have done that the association must have forfeited its title of International. The association does not dictate the form of political movements; it only requires a pledge as to their end. It is a network of affiliated societies spreading all over the world of labour. In each part of the world some special aspect of the problem presents itself, and the workmen there address themselves to its consideration in their own way. Combinations among workmen cannot be absolutely identical in detail in Newcastle and in Barcelona, in London and in Berlin. In England, for instance, the way to show political power lies open to the working class. Insurrection would be madness where peaceful agitation would more swiftly and surely do the work. In France a hundred laws of repression and a moral antagonism between classes seem to necessitate the violent solution of social war. The choice of that solution is the affair of the working classes of that country. The International does not presume to dictate in the matter and hardly to advise. But to every movement it accords its sympathy and its aid within the limits assigned by its own laws.

R.—And what is the nature of that aid?

Dr M.—To give an example, one of the commonest forms of the movement for emancipation is that of strikes. Formerly, when a strike took place in one country it was defeated by the importation of workmen from another. The International has nearly stopped all that.[3] It receives information of the intended strike, it spreads that information among its members, who at once see that for them the seat of the struggle must be forbidden ground. The masters are thus left alone to reckon with their men. In most cases the men require no other aid than that. Their own subscriptions or those of the societies to which they are more immediately affiliated supply them with funds, but should the pressure upon them become too heavy and the strike be one of which the association approves,

[3] As early as the spring of 1866, the General Council was active during tailors' strikes in Edinburgh and London when it successfully defeated employers' attempts to break the strikes by bringing in recruits from Germany. 'A Warning', written by Marx, was published in the *Oberrhenischer Courier* of May 15, 1866, urging German workers to stay away from England and Scotland so as 'to prove to other countries that they, like their brothers in France, Belgium and Switzerland, know how to defend the common interests of their class and will not become *obedient mercenaries of capital* in its struggle against Labour.' (*Documents of the First International: The General Council of the First International 1864-1866*, Moscow, n.d., pp. 367-8.) In 1869, at the suggestion of Andrew Cameron, delegate of the National Labour Union to the International Congress at Basel, the General Council established a Labour and Emigration Bureau to prevent the emigration of workers from Europe to replace strikers in the United States. (*See* Samuel Bernstein, *The First International in America*, New York, 1965, pp. 33-4.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their necessities are supplied out of the common purse. By these means a strike of the cigar-makers of Barcelona was brought to a victorious issue the other day. But the society has no interest in strikes, though it supports them under certain conditions. It cannot possibly gain by them in a pecuniary point of view, but it may easily lose. Let us sum it all up in a word. The working classes remain poor amid the increase of wealth, wretched among the increase of luxury. Their material privation dwarfs their moral as well as their physical stature. They cannot rely on others for a remedy. It has become then with them an imperative necessity to take their own case in hand. They must revise the relations between themselves and the capitalists and landlords, and that means they must transform society. This is the general end of every known workmen's organisation; land and labour leagues, trade and friendly societies, co-operative stores and co-operative production are but means towards it. To establish a perfect solidarity between these organisations is the business of the International Association. Its influence is beginning to be felt everywhere. Two papers spread its views in Spain, three in Germany, the same number in Austria and in Holland, six in Belgium, and six in Switzerland. And now that I have told you what the International is you may, perhaps, be in a position to form your own opinion as to its pretended plots.

R.—I do not quite understand you.

Dr M.—Do you not see that the old society, wanting strength to meet it with its own weapons of discussion and combination, is obliged to resort to the fraud of fixing upon it the imputation of conspiracy?

R.—But the French police declare that they are in a position to prove its complicity in the late affair, to say nothing of preceding attempts.

Dr M.—But we will say something of those attempts, if you please, because they best serve to test the gravity of all the charges of conspiracy brought against the International. You remember the last 'plot' but one. A plebiscite had been announced.[4] Many of the electors were known to be wavering. They had no longer a keen sense of the value of the imperial rule, having come to disbelieve in those threatened dangers of society from which it was supposed to have saved them. A new bugbear was wanted. The police under-

[4] The plebiscite was held by Napoleon III on May 7, 1870, to confirm some liberal constitutional changes offered by the government, and to provide a show of popular endorsement of the Empire. The International sections advocated abstention from voting.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took to find one. All combinations of workmen being hateful to them, they naturally owed the International an ill turn. A happy thought inspired them. What if they should select the International for their bugbear, and thus at once discredit that society and curry favour for the imperial cause? Out of that happy thought came the ridiculous 'plot' against the Emperor's life—as if we wanted to kill the wretched old fellow. They seized the leading members of the International. They manufactured evidence. They prepared their case for trial, and in the meantime they had their plebiscite.[5] But the intended comedy was too obviously but a broad, coarse farce. Intelligent Europe, which witnessed the spectacle, was not deceived for a moment as to its character, and only the French peasant elector was befooled. Your English papers reported the beginning of the miserable affair; they forgot to notice the end. The French judges, admitting the existence of the plot by official courtesy, were obliged to declare that there was nothing to show the complicity of the International. Believe me, the second plot is like the first. The French functionary is again in business. He is called in to account for the biggest civil movement the world has ever seen. A hundred signs of the times ought to suggest the right explanation—the growth of intelligence among the workmen, of luxury and incompetence among their rulers, the historical process now going on of that final transfer of power from a class to the people, the apparent fitness of time, place, and circumstance for the great movement of emancipation. But to have seen these the functionary must have been a philosopher, and he is only a *mouchard*.[6] By the law of his being, therefore, he has fallen back upon the *mouchard*'s explanation—a 'conspiracy'. His old portfolio of forged documents will supply him with the proofs, and this time Europe in its scare will believe the tale.

R.—Europe can scarcely help itself, seeing that every French newspaper spreads the report.

Dr M.—Every French newspaper! See, here is one of them [taking up *La Situation*], and judge for yourself of the value of its evidence as to a matter of fact. [Reads] 'Dr Karl Marx, of the International, has been arrested in Belgium, trying to make his way to France. The police of London have long had their eye on the society with which he is connected, and are now taking active measures for its suppression.' Two sentences and two lies. You can test the evidence

[5] On the eve of the plebiscite, the police conducted three mass arrests of members of the International. The trial, in June-July 1870, resulted in prison terms for a number of the International leaders.

[6] Police spy; informer.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of your own senses. You see that instead of being in prison in Belgium I am at home in England. You must also know that the police in England are as powerless to interfere with the International Society as the society with them. Yet what is most regular in all this is that the report will go the round of the continental press without a contradiction, and could continue to do so if I were to circularise every journal in Europe from this place.

R.—Have you attempted to contradict many of these false reports?

Dr M.—I have done so till I have grown weary of the labour. To show the gross carelessness with which they are concocted I may mention that in one of them I saw Félix Pyat set down as a member of the International.[7]

R.—And he is not so?

Dr M.—The association could hardly have found room for such a wild man. He was once presumptuous enough to issue a rash proclamation in our name, but it was instantly disavowed, though, to do them justice, the press of course ignored the disavowal.

R.—And Mazzini, is he a member of your body?[8]

Dr Marx [laughing]—Ah, no. We should have made but little progress if we had not got beyond the range of his ideas.

R.—You surprise me. I should certainly have thought that he represented the most advanced views.

Dr M.—He represents nothing better than the old idea of a middle class republic. We seek no part with the middle class. He has fallen far to the rear of the modern movement as the German professors, who, nevertheless, are still considered in Europe as the apostles of the cultured democratism of the future. They were so at one time—before '48, perhaps, when the German middle class, in the English sense, had scarcely attained its proper development. But now they have gone over bodily to the reaction, and the proletariat knows them no more.

R.—Some people have thought they saw signs of a positivist element in your organisation.[9]

---

[7] Marx frequently referred to Félix Pyat as the example of an extreme radical phrasemonger who specialised in invocations to terrorism just before he himself ran away. In a letter of May 12, 1871, Jenny Marx, Marx's daughter, referred to 'knights of the phrase like Félix Pyat. . . .' (Hal Draper, editor *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Writings on the Paris Commune*, New York and London, 1971, p. 223.)

[8] Guiseppe Mazzini (1805-1872) was the founder of 'Young Italy' and the European Democratic Committee with the objective of unifying Italy. His programme demanded the independence and unity of Italy under the slogan 'God and the People'. Marx frequently criticised the bourgeois character of Mazzini's programme.

[9] Positivism was the philosophy of the followers of August Comte, who took from Saint-Simon a religious-like belief in 'positive science', especially 'sociology' (a word Comte invented). The Positivists were bourgeois reformers, and, while they favoured

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr M.—No such thing. We have positivists among us, and others not of our body who work as well. But this is not by virtue of their philosophy, which will have nothing to do with popular government, as we understand it, and which seeks only to put a new hierarchy in place of the old one.

R.—It seems to me, then, that the leaders of the new international movement have had to form a philosophy as well as an association for themselves.

Dr M.—Precisely. It is hardly likely, for instance that we could hope to prosper in our war against capital if we derive our tactics, say, from the political economy of Mill. He has traced one kind of relationship between labour and capital. We hope to show that it is possible to establish another.

R.—And as to religion?

Dr M.—On that point I cannot speak in the name of the society. I myself am an atheist. It is startling, no doubt, to hear such an avowal in England, but there is some comfort in the thought that it need not be made in a whisper in either Germany or France.

R.—And yet you make your headquarters in this country?

Dr M.—For obvious reasons; the right of association is here an established thing. It exists, indeed, in Germany, but it is beset with innumerable difficulties; in France for many years it has not existed at all.

R.—And the United States?

Dr M.—The chief centres of our activity are for the present among the old societies of Europe. Many circumstances have hitherto tended to prevent the labour problem from assuming an all-absorbing importance in the United States. But they are rapidly disappearing, and it is rapidly coming to the front there with the growth as in Europe of a labouring class distinct from the rest of the community and divorced from capital.[10]

R.—It would seem that in this country the hoped for solution, whatever it may be, will be attained without the violent means of revolution. The English system of agitating by platform and press

---

a 'thorough moral adjustment of the relations of capital and labour', they opposed violence. Although the Positivists condemned its 'repressive measures', they were friendly to the Commune, and praised such legislative acts of the Commune as the abolition of the standing army, the repeal of capital punishment, and the admission of foreigners to office.

[10] On March 5, 1852, Marx wrote to Joseph Weydemeyer that 'bourgeois society in the United States has not yet developed far enough to make the class struggle obvious and comprehensible.' In 1881, however, he wrote to F. A. Sorge that in the United States 'capitalist economy and the corresponding enslavement of the working class have developed more *rapidly* and *shamelessly* than in any other country.' (Karl Marx & Frederick Engels, *Letters to Americans, 1848-1895*, New York, 1953, pp. 44, 129.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until minorities become converted into majorities is a hopeful sign.

Dr M.—I am not so sanguine on that point as you. The English middle class has always shown itself willing enough to accept the verdict of the majority so long as it enjoyed the monopoly of the voting power. But mark me, as soon as it finds itself outvoted on what it considers vital questions we shall see here a new slave-owners' war.

I have here given you as well as I can remember them the heads of my conversation with this remarkable man. I shall leave you to form your own conclusions. Whatever may be said for or against the probability of its complicity with the movement of the Commune we may be assured that in the International Association the civilised world has a new power in its midst with which it must soon come to a reckoning for good or ill.

Full time students will be interested in the special concession on *Labour Monthly* subscription rates. See inside back cover for details and subscription form.

In **NEW WORLD REVIEW, 1972, No. 1**

Meeting Soviet Jews
A Journey to North Korea
Ossie Davis: Film—a World View

In **No. 2**

GDR: Culture for the People
Experimental Theatre, USSR
People's Hungary Today

NEW WORLD REVIEW, 156 5th Ave., N.Y. 10010

Dear Sirs: I enclose $5.00 for a one-year subscription to *N WR*, to begin with No. 2; send No. 1 FREE (for a total of five issues).

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELEANOR MARX

Andrew Rothstein

IT is singularly appropriate that the life of one of the most outstanding figures in the international socialist movement of the nineteenth century, and in Marxist thought and action for all time, should have been written in England, where Eleanor Marx was born and worked, and by a British communist.* 'To understand socialism, to preach socialism and to live for socialism—that was her aim,' were the words of Wilhelm Liebknecht, one of her oldest friends as he had been her great father's, in his article in *Vorwärts*, the German Social-Democrats' paper, a few days after her death in 1898. It was how her contemporaries knew her: generation after generation of socialists since then have heard echoes of that appraisal of her, and been inspired by them. Yet until now there has been no socialist biography of Eleanor Marx, apart from a sympathetic and very stimulating, but necessarily very brief, account in the small book, *The Daughters of Marx*, by Olga Vorobyova and Irma Sinelnikova, of the Moscow Institute of Marxism-Leninism (it has appeared, so far, only in Russian and German). There has been, it is true, a painstaking study by a Japanese professor, Chushichi Tsuzuki, but it is not informed by socialist sympathies: it consequently misses a great deal of what animated her, and it falls all the more easily into a kind of shallow psychologism which Eleanor Marx would have been the first to repudiate. Now we have the opening of a major contribution to socialist and working class history.

The opening—because this first volume covers the years from her birth in 1855 until the death of Karl Marx and his wife in 1883, and Eleanor's joining her life with that of Edward Aveling, the same year. The title given to this volume suits the period exactly: 'Family Life'. But no one should think that it is only or mainly that, in the narrow sense. It is an account which at every step considers the material and moral conditions of Marx's life and work, those in which Eleanor's thoughts and character were formed. This was the period of a terrible gulf separating the mass of the working class from its tiny vanguard of socialists or even radical thinkers—itself the reflection of a still more frightful gulf between the living standards of the masses and the elementary necessities, not to say comforts, of a civilised existence. It was the period about which William

* *Eleanor Marx Vol. I.* Yvonne Kapp, *Lawrence & Wishart*, 320 pp. £4.50.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morris, in his diary for 1887, wondered 'if people will remember, in times to come, to what a depth of degradation the ordinary English workman has been reduced': while the socialists who began to sing *The Red Flag*, a little later, were still recalling the time 'when all ahead seemed dark as night'. Marx and his family had no protective barrier against such hardships, as Yvonne Kapp's book describes again and again, paying full tribute to the self-denial and courage of Marx's wife and to the lion-like strength of revolutionary determination with which Marx carried on with his work to the very last, rising above all the physical and mental suffering which he endured. No one can read this book without realising that the single-minded fighting spirit of both parents served more than anything else to form the character of Eleanor, the daughter nearest of all in that respect to her father.

However, the author does not by any means depict her as a purely 'political animal', without fun and quaint ways and many friends as a child, without boundless enthusiasms and romantic sentiments as a young girl, without warm friendships, violent resentments, deep sorrows and sincere passions as a grown woman. With a wealth of detail, Yvonne Kapp gives a full, flesh-and-blood picture of Eleanor Marx the human being: her father himself had adopted the Roman poet's motto: 'I am human, and count nothing human of indifference to me'. The author has gone to immense trouble in following up the activities of those whose paths crossed Marx's or Eleanor's, opening up sources, documentary or otherwise, which no one else has ever touched, or maybe could have touched. Sometimes the material discovered in this way seems for a moment to overwhelm the main subject—but only for a moment. Possibly because in the past Yvonne Kapp has been a novelist (as the list of her previous writings, opposite the title page, will reveal to many) her literary style throughout retains an uncommonly pungent flavour and swinging impetus which carries her easily through such moments.

These qualities have their (very occasional) drawbacks. In commenting on an encouraging letter to Eleanor from her sister Jenny Longuet, about a possible stage career, the author appends a footnote (p. 234) which by the obscurity of its allusions will, I am sure, puzzle others as it did me.' Again, without attempting any serious proofs, she makes sweeping assertions about Paul Lafargue (and his wife Laura Marx)—'no genius' (p. 75), 'a trivial pair', despite Lafargue's 'valuable contribution' to the movement (p. 281) and of his pamphlet *The Right to be Lazy*, that on this subject 'he was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an expert' (the same page)—as though such waspish judgements were adequate to characterise a man internationally respected for decades as an outstanding propagandist of Marxism in many different fields, as an unswerving critic of opportunism and revisionism when these were eating away the foundations laid in a number of parties by Marx and Engels, as one of the founders of the French Workers' Party and its first revolutionary spokesman in parliament: one of whom Lenin said at his funeral (December 3, 1911) that he was 'one of the most talented and profound disseminators of the ideas of Marxism', and whose works on philosophy and against revisionism Lenin included in the recommended reading list of his well-known work *Karl Marx* (1913).

However, these are but fleeting departures from the logic of a most impressive piece of scholarship and an invaluable addition to any socialist's bookshelf, as well as to any public library. The second volume, which is to describe Eleanor Marx's activity in the British working class movement from 1883 until her death, will be eagerly awaited.

IRAQ

Mehdi Al-Hafidh*

This article was written before the reorganisation of the Iraqi Government with the inclusion of two Communist ministers—Ed. *LM.*

IMPORTANT events have recently taken place in Iraq both in the economic and in the political sphere. The first steps have been taken for the national exploitation of petroleum deposits in Northern Rumaila, the signing of a treaty of friendship and co-operation between Iraq and the USSR, and the creation of a more favourable atmosphere for the national front. It is no accident that these events are interdependent and that they took place in the political climate which emerged in Iraq some time ago.

The problem of Iraqi oil is the main reason for strife between the national democratic movement in Iraq and the foreign monopolies. This problem has not changed in the fourteen years that have elapsed since the beginning of the democratic revolution in Iraq (the revolution of June 14, 1958). In the past few years this

* Mehdi Al-Hafidh is Vice-President of the International Union of Students, and representative of the General Union of Students in the Iraqi Republic.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problem has come to the fore in Iraq's political and economic development, and has been the cause of many conflicts and unhappy experiences which befell the revolutionary movement. The great importance of the problem of Iraqi oil stems from the nature and size of the role oil plays in Iraq's national economy and of the enormous profits imperialist monopolies draw from its production. The Iraqi economy is a clear example of a one-sided economy so typical of underdeveloped countries, and it is the result of colonial domination.

Petroleum production represents approximately one half of the country's national income. The revenues Iraq draws from oil represent over 70 per cent of all financial resources of the state and of its development plans. This income is also the main source of foreign currency for Iraq. The production of oil in Iraq is completely in the hands of British, American, French and Dutch monopolies united in the IPC (Iraq Petroleum Company), the only company exploiting Iraqi oil since the time the first wells were drilled and export of petroleum began.

The method of direct national exploitation of oil remains the main objective for the liberation of Iraq's oil riches from foreign monopolies. It creates economic and technical conditions which would enable Iraq to deal a decisive blow to imperialist interests. This national demand has not, as yet, been fought out to full realisation although it has been put forward by several Iraqi governments, especially since the 1961 law Number 80. According to this law, 99.5 per cent of the territories not being exploited by the petroleum monopolies were to be returned to Iraq. This has not been carried out. Various plots and manoeuvres have, for 11 years, prevented the development and building of an independent petroleum industry in Iraq. During that period the petroleum companies, supported by the imperialist governments, made every effort to bring about the repeal of law Number 80. The persistent struggle of the Iraqi national movement prevented this, and the developments that have now taken place are closely connected with the application of this law and with the beginning of the national exploitation of petroleum deposits in Northern Rumaila, made possible thanks to the co-operation of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The region of Northern Rumaila was chosen as the first site for the National Iraqi Petroleum Company because of its vast reserves of good quality petroleum and its proximity to the export port of Fau.

This co-operation with the socialist countries is a guarantee of success in the struggle against foreign petroleum monopolies and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the building of an independent oil industry. Aware of this fact, the Baath Government in Iraq has signed a number of agreements on economic and technical co-operation with the Soviet Union, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic. The first of these agreements was signed with the Soviet Union in July 1969 to the value of 25 million dinars. According to this agreement the Soviet Union was to furnish the Iraqi National Company with machinery and equipment and was to send specialists to Iraq for geological surveys and for drilling. Another agreement was signed between Iraq and the Soviet Union in July 1969 for the building of an integrated oil industry in Northern Rumaila. On the basis of this agreement, the Soviet Union granted Iraq a loan of 24 million dollars to be repaid in petroleum. The total amount represented by these two agreements is approximately 130 million dollars. Other agreements with socialist countries concerning the oil industry were prepared: an agreement with the Soviet Union signed in April 1971 for the building of an oil refinery in Mosul, one for a pipe-line between Baghdad and Basra, and others. On the basis of the April 1971 agreement the Soviet Union will grant Iraq a loan of 80 million dollars to be repaid in petroleum. Another contract signed with Hungary in 1970 was for the drilling of several wells in Northern Rumaila. The drilling has already been completed.

This close co-operation between Iraq, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the field of the oil industry has led to the beginning of national exploitation of petroleum in Northern Rumaila and to its first exports at the beginning of April this year. This event was celebrated as a festive occasion by the Iraqi people, Arabs and Kurds alike, not only because it will help to establish real economic independence, free from international imperialist monopolies, but because it is linked with the signing of the treaty of friendship and co-operation between Iraq and the Soviet Union which strengthens Iraq's position in the struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction, offers the necessary help for the safeguarding of Iraq's independence and its economic and social achievements, and opens the way to a perspective of overcoming backwardness in various fields. Alexei Kosygin said in Baghdad during the signing of the treaty:

> This treaty has all the conditions that can turn it into an active instrument for the establishment of favourable conditions for the co-ordination of our efforts in the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and for the achievement and strengthening of peace in the Middle East as part of the easing of international tension.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialist interests have continued their efforts to win back their positions in Iraq, and to reverse the progressive achievements of the Iraqi people. This danger necessitates serious attention to the strengthening of the domestic front, in particular for the establishment of an alliance of all progressive forces and for the elimination of all factors responsible for mutual distrust. It also requires the granting of democratic freedoms and the formation of a national coalition government.

Objective conditions are ripe for the co-operation of progressive forces within the national front: this is reflected in the economic, social and political successes of recent years and also in the nature of the dangerous period through which Iraq is passing at the moment, no less than the peoples in all the Arab countries. There is danger also in the continued Israeli aggression against the Arab countries. Differences between patriotic forces have, unfortunately, prevented, and to a certain extent are still preventing, advances in an otherwise favourable atmosphere for the relations of these forces in Iraq, especially since the publication of the Charter of the National Front, by the Baath Party in November of last year. The national front still finds obstacles in its path which can be overcome only if the various bodies forming the national front will fulfil their responsibility for the future of the country and for its future progressive development.

The Communist Party of Iraq welcomed the Charter of the National Front as an anti-imperialist document. The Charter defined the principles and objectives of the national liberation struggle and in spite of certain weaknesses it contributes to national co-operation. A very wide and useful discussion about the proposed Charter has taken place during the last few months in newspapers, magazines, on radio and television. Patriotic spokesmen have voiced their opinions and better conditions have been created for a dialogue which could lead to the formulation of a more compact Charter and to its implementation. The Communist Party of Iraq has called for the development of various forms of co-operation between community organisations, political parties and patriotic forces, as a necessary condition for a closer alliance.

The creation of a national front in Iraq, the further strengthening of Iraq's relations with socialist countries and the application of a firm anti-imperialist policy, in particular against the oil monopolies, together provide the key to the overcoming of both the external and internal dangers, and the guarantee for the road towards liberation and social progress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Honour of Georgi Dimitrov

HOW WE BUILT LEFT UNITY IN BRITAIN

Isabel Brown

THE rise of fascism in the twenties in Italy and Germany roused alarm in the ranks of all genuine socialists. We could not accept the theory that it was an expression of discontent among the middle classes. Herbert Morrison said: 'Ignore it and it will disappear.' Georgi Dimitrov was one of the first in 1928 to state: 'Fascism is not a new form of state power, but the extreme expression of capitalism and imperialism.' His was one of the first voices to summon the people to the struggle against fascism.

We had formed in Britain a 'Committee for the Victims of Fascism' of which I was the Secretary. As the danger loomed larger, especially in Germany, many people, roused by our exposures of the real face of Hitlerism, joined our Committee—to name a few: Ellen Wilkinson MP, Kingsley Martin, Lord Marley, Lord Listowel, Ivor Montagu, Professors Haldane, Julian Huxley, Lancelot Hogben, writers H. G. Wells, J. B. Priestley, Sir Stafford Cripps and dozens of other well known people. For the first time for many years we really had got a united front against fascism that broke all barriers of parties and professions—in fact from all sections of society—with the trade unions and co-operatives, the working class as its firm basis.

It was this Committee, on the arrest of Dimitrov and his colleagues by the Nazis, accused of burning the Reichstag, that immediately got to work on a large scale. Great mass meetings filled large halls in almost every city and town in Britain, with speakers of great renown in science, literature, church, trade unions and all democratic parties. Their exposure of the real horrors of Hitlerism had a profound effect on the thinking and feeling of the mass of British people. Support and money from varied organisations and people, poured in to help our work.

We feared that Dimitrov and his friends would disappear into the hideous concentration camps. So we determined to force the Nazis to bring them to open trial. This we did by organising the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Enquiry into the Burning of the Reichstag'. A group of international lawyers from France, Sweden, Netherlands, US, Britain and other countries, all of high repute, agreed to come to London and in the Court of the Law Society examine the evidence—much of it from refugees from Germany; they questioned them and finally after four to five days reached their unanimous verdict that our comrades were innocent. Sir Stafford Cripps—as President of the Court—made the opening speech, but the main work was done by the indefatigable D. N. Pritt, QC, who presided over the whole of the proceedings. The whole world press featured this London trial. German comrades have told me since that they were then still able to get the *Times* in Berlin. They duplicated its very full reports and distributed them clandestinely under the very noses of the Nazis. This gave a tremendous uplift to the German comrades, to know of our work here.

Then came the Leipzig trial, in public, when Dimitrov and colleagues were brought manacled to face their accusers. Then Georgi Dimitrov took the centre of the stage—from accused he became the accuser. He defended himself, his party, his country with such vigour that he became the hero of all the world.

The final acquittal was gained, not only by world solidarity and our Enquiry in London, but mainly by Dimitrov himself. Who will ever forget his baiting of Goering, his ability to formulate his defence, manacled in a prison cell—it was a tribute not only to his indomitable courage, but to his Marxist understanding. It was a noble victory.

But to my mind the biggest victory flowing from this campaign was the mass movement created, the understanding of what unity of all progressive forces could achieve. It laid the basis of the growth of that movement, and led to popular front governments in France and Spain. This need for unity was crystalised in Dimitrov's report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

Such simple words: 'Unity in the smallest action leads the way forward.' But for me Dimitrov's greatest contribution was that in life itself, facing as he did a fearful death at the hands of the Nazis, he demonstrated how true is our own popular trade union slogan 'Unity is Strength'.

It was the lessons we learned from this mass campaign and the even greater one in 1936 for Spain that helped us to formulate the *British Road to Socialism*, and gave deeper meaning to the main slogan for the working class today—'Unity of the Left'.

Everlasting glory to the memory of Georgi Dimitrov.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HONOUR OF A COMMUNIST

'I am defending myself, an accused Communist.

I am defending my political honour, my honour as a revolutionary.

I am defending my Communist ideology, my ideals.

I am defending the content and significance of my whole life.'

(Dimitrov, concluding speech before the Reich Court in Leipzig on December 16, 1933)

THE TOUCHSTONE

'In the present international situation there is not, nor can there be, any other, more certain criterion than one's attitude toward the Soviet Union, in determining who is the friend and who the enemy of the cause of the working class and socialism, of determining who is the supporter and who an opponent of democracy and peace. The touchstone in deciding the sincerity and honesty of every individual active in the working class movement, of every working class party and organisation of the working people and of every democrat in the capitalist countries, is their attitude toward the great land of socialism.'

(Dimitrov, *The Soviet Union and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries*, November 1937)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHILDREN'S BOOKS

Nicola Seyd

'BIASED, prejudiced, inaccurate, or just plain dull': this is Janet Hill's assessment of all too many of the children's books in a survey completed last October. The books concerned were all those published in Britain and in print on January 1, 1970, about some of the areas and countries 'from which people have come here to settle' (Africa, Cyprus, India and Pakistan, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Turkey and the West Indies). A group of fourteen children's librarians undertook this large project 'in the belief that it might influence . . . writers, publishers, librarians, parents, teachers and reviewers.'

The results of their award-winning work are available in the handy form of a booklist.* Certainly this list should now be in the hands of every children's librarian and school librarian. Through its availability in these libraries, it should be accessible to every parent and teacher. Should be. But there must be a mountainous job of persuading very many of its importance. For example, its use is *not* limited to towns where immigrants have settled, and where their children (or grandchildren) are among those using school or public libraries. Frighteningly, *every child in Britain* who learns to read books is at risk of being biased, prejudiced, misled or just plain bored by stories and 'information' available at present in libraries and bookshops.

This list is elaborate enough to include a review of each book in the survey, after giving author, title, publisher and other details. Each is then given a grading of A, B or C, so that one can see at a glance which books are well recommended and which to be particularly careful to avoid (to be cast out at once by all librarians, or at least not to be replaced when dilapidation forces a decision).

The first C-graded book among those set in South Africa, *Highveld Mystery* by R. Burns (Blackie, 1951), is reviewed thus:

> Living in a world of 'fine chaps' and 'rotters', an English family move on to a farm in South Africa, easily accepting the 'master/boy' relationship under the guidance of a neighbour who knows Africans 'must be talked to like children', and become involved in solving a complex but remarkable mystery.

---

* *Books for Children: The Homelands of Immigrants in Britain*, edited by Janet Hill. *Institute of Race Relations*, 86 pp., £1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first to merit an A-grading is Fitzpatrick's *Jock of the Bushveld* (Longmans Young Books, new edition 1949):

> A classic story of a dog and his master set in nineteenth-century South Africa. The novel is based on fact and gives an authentic picture of life in the bush and mining camps of the early Transvaal.

Some of the notes go to greater lengths than these two, but most convey the essential praise or warning, and an adequate description, in a few lines.

The more politically conscious reader may regret that the less obvious class bias in some of the books was not considered significant by the group, whose main concern was with displays of paternalism towards 'natives' and foreigners in general, and with the standards the books achieved (or did not) of information and readability. Quite reasonably, for a survey undertaken in this way, with books having been read by different members of the group, sometimes by more than one member in order to bring out and resolve differences of opinion, one would expect some unevenness in the detailed results. Two of their mini-reviews I would pick out to contrast the very clear political appreciation in one case, and the lack of it in another. The first is about *Getting to Know Poland* by J. A. Wallace (Muller, 1961):

> A dangerously simple and incredibly biased view of Poland redolent of the atmosphere of the cold war and McCarthyism in America. It is strange that it was published as it stands in this country. One of a poor series which introduces countries to young children, this volume is an outstanding example of naïve and hysterical anti-communism, and the dreaded word is mentioned on almost every page. Amusingly, the text hammers home the indoctrination of Polish children, but no indoctrination could be more blatant that this book.

That was graded firmly with a C. The second is Burchell's *Building the Suez Canal* (Cassell, 1967), rightly given A-grading under the terms of reference of the list. This is reviewed in glowing terms: 'political intrigues' and the 'implacable opposition of the British Government' to de Lesseps's canal-building plans are mentioned. But the book itself suffers from the great weakness of treating the story as the personal achievement of de Lesseps, aided or hindered by various rulers and business men, with 'labourers' being supplied by Egypt's viceroy. The group's review in no way suggests that more could have been shown of the suffering and death toll—and the enormous achievement—of those conscripted labourers, the Egyptian people.

But the information in the list is otherwise of such unquestionable

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value that one sincerely hopes it will run to a second and further successful editions to keep it up to date until such a time as it may cease to be necessary. Some of the general conclusions to be drawn at this time are very revealing.

The most important is the obvious failure of so many publishers to recognise that it matters what they publish, and on the part of those who work with children not to have made more complaints in the past, and more demands for the wider use of the better books which are available. The group recorded with regret that some among the very best books had been allowed to go out of print quite recently, while new hack writers are still cashing in on the children's market.

A close look at the list shows that there are 'good' and 'bad' publishers. I would pick out as 'good' the Bodley Head (ten As, five Bs and no Cs), Collins (8-5-0), Longmans Young Books (6-5-0), Oxford University Press (12-26-0), and a faultless record by André Deutsch (7-0-0). Black, the publishers of *Who's Who*, have a record to match their name (advocates of 'black is good', please note my lapse here into the traditional simile, possibly due to having read some of these books in my own childhood): they score no As, seven Bs and five Cs; but the prize for 'badness' goes without any doubt to Paternoster Press (0-0-23). The pitiful overall result is that so many publishers contribute only one or two books to this field of children's reading: of the 75 publishers who appear, 32 were responsible for only one or two books each; one assumes there must be many more who make no contribution at all.

The group noted that books brought out as 'series' tended to be dull: in the 211 books in the section on Africa, 50 out of 86 'series' books (58 per cent) were graded C, while the failure rate among the others was only 24 out of 125 (19 per cent).

Year of publication is not such a reliable guide; the proportion of bad books in this section (Africa) seems to have decreased up to the vintage year of 1967 (only two graded C out of 22 published), but some bad ones bumped the proportion up again in 1969—five due to the US publishers Abelard Schuman, and one by the British Broadcasting Corporation.

The strongest trend is unfortunately with price. Books costing over £1 in 1969 (and what would they cost now!) had an almost absolute guarantee of quality: no Cs among the 17 books at this end of the scale in the Africa section, and the pattern is repeated in the other sections with the single exception being M. Saville's *Three Towers in Tuscany* (Heinemann, 1963, £1.25 yet graded C).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the other end, books under ten shillings in price scored 2-23-50. It seems to follow that ignorance and prejudice are on offer to all, while tolerance and understanding are reserved for those with money—or the will to insist on what they want to find in their library.

SINGAPORE ANNIVERSARY

Peter Kingsford

ON February 15, 1942, Singapore fell to the Japanese. On the same date four years later the Malay police shot dead thirteen demonstrators, including two women and five children, at the village of Labis in Johore state. Certainly all demonstrations to mark the anniversary had been forbidden. All the same the punishment seemed extreme even though the excuse given by the police (some excuse seemed to be required) was that the demonstrators were using the women and children as a screen. The excuse was accepted officially by the British Military Authority.

I noted these facts with shame and anger in my diary at the time. Shame because I was an officer in the army which stood behind the police; anger because of impotence to act against the restoration of reaction. The British Army had also another task, to train Dutch soldiers to be able to repress nationalism in Indonesia. I had disembarked at Singapore with the second infantry division from Bombay three days before Christmas 1945. I noted:

> As we drew in to the quayside the docks looked dilapidated. Little Japanese soldiers in peaked cloth caps, bare to the waist, brown, stocky, muscular, marched to work. It was steamy; the Devons struggled down the gangway; one comment from a soldier staggering under his kit—'Well its better than fuck all isn't it?'

It was a great deal better. After we had bedded down in Johore the place was attractive after India, but the realities of the situation began to appear:

> This country has a soft seductive charm. The lazy air, the greenness, still waters, luxuriance of fruit, flowers and trees, the Chinese and Malayan women. A country in which one could easily relax and wait for life to flow by. Swam deliciously in the flat, tepid sea. The people in a miserable state—inflation, scarcity, black market. Communist Party is representative of the people—official! Terrorism imputed to them. Jap prisoners used to break Malayan labour strikes in docks and gasworks. The fascist full circle. Wretched situation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind all this was the main political question—what was to be the nature and form of the future government of Malaya. On January 22 the Labour Government in London had issued a White Paper setting out proposals for a new Malayan Union. The White Paper turned its back on the system of indirect rule by the sultans which had been the cardinal point of British policy. These were to be replaced by a Governor, and resident commissioners in each state, an executive and legislative council and local representative councils. Singapore was to be a separate colony. Citizenship was a crucial and difficult point; it was to be given to those native born and those who had ten years' residence out of the preceding fifteen. Would Malaya accept the White Paper? In the struggle around it which of the contending parties and groups would come out on top?

These were numerous, ranging all the way from left to right, having sprung into being during the Japanese occupation and immediately after it. Nearly all parties rejected the London proposals, more or less, and for different reasons. Political activity became intense. In our mess, a handsome bungalow with large lofty airy rooms all open to the night, on a bluff overlooking the straits, I noted:

> This is a queer atmosphere. There is the lazy air, the slight stupor of heat always, golden sun, blue sea, lush greenness, the silent, still nights. Among the people a strong movement pushing forward for freedom. Amidst this overpowering natural beauty there is that other world of continuous political tactic and counter-tactic. The people's leaders thinking ahead furiously of the next move against the British Military Authority. The Chinese in the cafés discuss what steps, violent or peaceful, must be taken. Intrigue and manoeuvre, angling for position, estimation of the alignment of political forces, continually changing, goes on all the time. Yet all we can see is a world of startling colours, alien heat, and the incomprehensible faces of the people.

On the extreme right of the spectrum stood two parties, the Kesatuan Malayu and the Persatuan Malayu, both racial in their emphasis on the interests of the Malays against Chinese economic control and for the *status quo ante*. In the centre the Progressive Movement of Peninsular Malays sought to arouse national consciousness particularly among the Kampong or village people. Led by a government official who gave his whole time to it, it had the blessing of the British. Left of centre, the Malay Nationalist Party stood for racial equality, and Malaya within the wider unity of Indonesia, and was suspected of connections with the Communists. Three groups plus the General Labour Union (GLU) formed the left wing: the Malayan

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democratic Union, mainly Chinese, wanted self government within the Commonwealth; the Democratic Youth League, mainly Chinese and communist, with its programme of political education; and the Malayan Communist Party itself.

The considerable influence of the MCP came from the war record of the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army which it had organised in 1942, a record which was recognised when the supreme commander, South East Asia, Lord Louis Mountbatten, decorated its leaders for bravery. During the war itself the policy was not only to defeat Japan but to prevent the resumption of British rule, and prepare for revolution and power. At the end of the war self-determination and a freely elected government was the panacea. On the industrial side the General Labour Union had begun to show its strength in October 1945 with several strikes. By the end of January 1946 it felt ready to call a general strike to demand the release of several leaders arrested on 'serious charges'. According to the *Straits Times*:

> Yesterday a movement which had a small beginning developed into major proportions, and is stated to involve nearly 173,000 workers. The strike has almost paralysed trade and business in the city, and police are standing by. Troops are guarding important institutions and buildings.

The strike was called off after two days, without result. *SEAC*, the Forces newspaper, righteous in its cause, said: 'It is fascism, which is the rule by terror of a bunch of bullies.' A fortnight later came the anniversary of the fall of Singapore. I noted:

> Attempts to browbeat the people, and provocation. Popular demonstrations expected tomorrow, therefore today air demonstrations over main towns. Flag marches in Singapore and Johore and a company of infantry in the municipal buildings.

There was in fact some trouble in Singapore. An illegal open air meeting led to fighting, the police opened fiire, and a Communist leader was arrested. Before being sentenced to two years' imprisonment he claimed, according to the *Straits Times*: 'It was most reasonable to hold the commemoration of February 15, so as to impress upon the people it was a day of humiliation.' The slaughter at Labis took place at the same time. A month later I wrote in my diary:

> Scene—a dead end street in Johore Bahru. A rough stage is erected, harshly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lit by gas lamps from which the improvised shades of pink paper have dropped off. Three hundred people sit, stand, hang on to railings, walls, lean out of upper windows—Malays, Chinese, Sikhs, Tamils. They are absorbed in the stage. There are three short plays showing Malaya before the Japs came, during the Jap occupation and during the 'BMA occupation'.

At first it seems slow—there are long intervals of inaction between speech and action. Suddenly after a wait something happens; nothing leads up to it. The plays advance in harsh brutal jerks, like the scenes themselves. Voices of the Communists in jail, singing, full of anguish and hope. The last play about the Labis victims. It seemed to show that the hope of freedom, which had sprung up as the Japs went, had again withered under the British regime. Neat attractive efficiency of young women organising the show. Solid, tough Malay police contrast with slight, nervy Chinese. Impression of a people on the move learning eagerly about politics by this simple means. Perhaps a small piece of history moving on to a bigger conclusion. Scepticism of my companions overcome by obvious sincerity and friendliness. Little Chinese clerk, GLU man, interprets for us, laughs and jokes but is very serious.

In the following months opposition to the Government's White Paper grew and eventually, in 1948, the Government introduced a compromise. The new constitution, the Federation of Malaya, of that year was weighted against the Chinese, by the extension of the residential qualifications for citizenship, one type being automatic and another by application, and by the predominantly Malay representation in the state and federal governments. The resentment among the people against the Federation even before it began was followed only a few months later by the armed revolt, led by the Communists. The men who had been decorated by the British for their bravery in the Anti-Japanese Army were now hunted by them.

BOOKS

The Formation of the Economic Thought of Karl Marx

Ernest Mandel

NLB, 224 pp., £2.25

DURING THE LAST two or three decades there has been a growing interest everywhere in Marxist theory expressed in a widened front of probing research into questions relating to the history of the theoretical thought of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This is understandable. Here, as in other sciences, the postulate holds good that a knowledge of the history of the subject is a necessary prerequisite for a better grasp of the subject itself.

The origin and the formation of Marxist political economy has been specially dealt with in a number of works by scholars in the USSR, German Democratic Republic, France, US and other countries. Ernest Mandel's work on the economic theory of Marxism has gained considerable attention in official propaganda in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West. Other of his works of a less scientific quality did not escape the notice of bourgeois publicity either.

One cannot help speculating, however, that Mandel's name features so often as it does in a laudatory context in the press of the monopolies, not because of the merits of his writings, but above all because of his definite political orientation. Usually Mandel is presented to us as 'a leading militant' of the Fourth International, as a neo-Trotskyist, a leading economist of the Trotskyist trend (see *Der Spiegel*, January 24, 1962).

Apart from his scientific activities Mandel publishes the Brussels weekly, *La Gauche*—organ of the 'New Left', which is not apparently inclined to confine itself within the national boundaries of Belgium, that is to say, it has pretensions to a wider international impact.

In the present book concerning the formation of the economic thought of Karl Marx (translated from the French by Brian Pearce) Mandel has set out to trace the evolution of Marxist political economy from its earliest beginnings in 1843 down to the writing of *Capital*, an aim whose fulfilment calls for solid knowledge and research experience.

The author gives the reader much information concerning Marx's and Engels's elaboration of their economic views in the process of their critique of bourgeois political economy and scientific analysis of the capitalist scene. He tries to give polemical point to his essay, argues or agrees with other authors, whom he quotes copiously.

Credit must be given him for his attempt to investigate the complexities of the evolution of Marx's views from the earliest period of his creative quest down to his mature years, when he appears as founder of the theory of surplus value. An attempt is made to show the continuity of the main ideas relating to the different stages of Marx's scientific work. In this respect Mandel's book shows to good advantage over the familiar and quite artificial constructions in which the 'young Marx' is counterposed to the 'mature Marx'—the author of *Capital*, the 'young Marx', a sort of 'Olympian giant', compared with the Marx of the sixties to eighties who had suffered a 'decline of thought', and so forth.

Mandel disagrees with those who insist on a 're-evaluation' of *Capital* in the light of Marx's *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*; he sees no reason for such a re-evaluation. Incidentally, in dealing with the different attitudes towards this early work of Marx, Mandel obviously distorts the truth (whether wilfully or not is another matter) when he asserts that 'official communist writers' (?!) are in the same camp with bourgeois writers such as Fromm, Rubel, Calvez and others (p. 164).

As for Communists, that is, Marxist-Leninists, they, as far as we know, adhere to the view that the *Manuscripts* reflect the initial stage of formation of Marx's economic views and therefore it would be illogical to ascribe to them the equation of the *Manuscripts* and *Capital*. As regards the bourgeois writers, they 'oddly enough' (as Mandel puts it) did set out to prove with sundry variations that in 1844 Marx had reached his peak, that already at that time he had fully worked out his 'humanistic', 'integral' doctrine and subsequently at least showed no signs of any appreciable growth.

Assessing this book on its merits from a professional standpoint, however, one feels constrained to reproach the author on a number of essential points.

First of all, it is a matter of surprise that a book on the *formation* of economic thought should have been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

written, not on a basis of logically interrelated chapters, but in the form of what looks like a collection of separate disconnected essays (eleven in all) with numerous digressions having no direct bearing on the matter in hand. Moreover, the whole of the concluding chapter 'Progressive Disalienation Through the Building of Socialist Society, or Inevitable Alienation in Industrial Society?' has here the appearance of a gratuitous makeweight. The interests of an effective treatment of the basic theme would have been better served by a more economic and rational management of the book's limited space, instead of trying without special need to comment on all the pressing problems of our day. The cheap exercises in anti-communism and reiteration of the threadbare clichés of bourgeois propaganda are anything but an adornment to a book whose very title implies scientific objectivity.

The book has no central idea, no keynote of its own, and the author's main design is only faintly traceable. The preface, usual in scientific publications, is missing, and the reader is left to puzzle out for himself what is meant by the term '*formation*'—whether it is the whole history of Marx's economic thought or only part of it, and why the exposition ends with the year 1863 and not, say, with 1859, when the first part of *A Critique of Political Economy* was published, or the year 1867 when the first volume of *Capital* appeared. We believe that the 'formation' as such of Marx's economic thought ends with the period which saw the elaboration of the theory of value, including its highest form (money) and the theory of surplus value, and this took place towards the close of the fifties. This was followed by a development of Marxist political economy already on its own scientific foundations.

In dealing with the problems of Marx's work in the field of political economy at that period (the 50s) one should concentrate on Marx's major achievements and discoveries, which are listed by Engels in his Preface to Volume II of *Capital* (1885), namely: (1) principled criticism of Ricardo's theory of value; study of labour from the angle of its capacity to create value; discovery of the dual nature of labour (abstract labour and concrete labour); (2) creation of the first comprehensive theory of money; (3) demonstration of the actual process of formation of surplus value; (4) science's first demonstration of the basic features of the history of capitalist accumulation and exposition of its historical tendencies.

One cannot say that these discoveries are ignored. Here and there they are mentioned, but so inexpressively that everything that is said is submerged in a mass of secondary, minor arguments. This is perhaps the book's main weakness. In its treatment of the principal features of Marx's economic theory it does not only fall far short of other recent researches by Marxists, but is obviously weaker than, for instance, the work of the nineteenth-century Russian economist N. Sieber, notably his elaborate monograph *David Ricardo and Karl Marx in their Socio-Economic Researches*. But Mandel, I believe, does not know Russian and is unfamiliar with the Russian literature—decidedly the richest on questions dealing with the history and content of Marx's economic doctrine.

The historian of theory is obliged to cover all existing materials and study archive documents. Mandel, apparently, has neglected to do so. He does not cite known publication of such documents and does not analyse those which have not yet been published, but which are made available

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to researchers, notably by the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, in which a large number of Marx and Engels manuscripts are concentrated.

It is a matter of regret that Mandel has virtually overlooked that most interesting period of Marx's scholarly studies after the defeat of the revolutions of 1848-49 and up to the moment he wrote the *Grundrisse*. He does not analyse Marx's famous synopses of 1850-51 on political economy. He lightly takes on trust the erroneous assertion of Rubel that 'between August 1852 and the end of 1856 Marx was obliged to abandon his economic studies' (p. 80). Dealing in a special chapter with the problem of periodic crises, Mandel merely one-sidedly stresses Marx's 'mistaken diagnosis' (p. 74) as to when the next crisis was due, instead of concentrating on the positive treatment of the general theoretical aspects of the problem of the industrial cycle in which Marx was intensively and fruitfully engaged in the fifties.

Throughout this period Marx did not cease to study capitalist economics, chiefly those of England. He did not simply accumulate facts and statistical data, but digested them, reassessed such bourgeois classics as Smith and Ricardo, which he had read long ago, and read and made careful synopses of books he had not earlier read. His theory of money, theory of surplus value, did not arise 'from the foam of the sea', at one go, during the brief space of time spent on *Grundrisse*, but took shape gradually as a result of intensive thinking, and this process was reflected in Marx's excerpts and notes, in his letters and his writings during the fifties. Mandel should not have passed over these things, which so clearly reveal the workings of Marx's mind.

Other shortcomings of the book are, in general, an insufficiently profound exposition of the problems dealt with while covering sufficiently wide, if not excessive, ground. For example, the book speaks of Marx having rejected communism in the early period of his publicist activities (p. 14). Such an unqualified statement can hardly be accepted. True, Marx, unlike Engels, did not at once proclaim himself an adherent of communism. The thing is, however, what kind of communism do we have in mind? What should have been stated is that if Marx did reject communism, it certainly was not the kind of communism that was regarded as a possible and necessary social alternative to capitalist society. As a matter of fact he urged a critical attitude to the then widespread utopian and dogmatic doctrines of communism. In September 1843 he stated outright in his letter to A. Ruge that in speaking about necessary assistance to be given to 'dogmatists' in elucidating to them their propositions he had in mind 'not just any *imaginary and possible* communism, but a really existent communism as preached by Cabet, Dezami and others' (MEGA Abt. 1, Bd. 1, 1, S.573).

We know what a conspicuous place in the process of formation and in the system of economic views of Marx is held by his classical work *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859) published as the result of a thorough reworking of the corresponding parts of *Grundrisse*. Mandel, in effect, makes no attempt to analyse this work on the specious plea that it 'has had less impact, from the time it was published until today, owing to its abstract nature' (p. 80).

Unfortunately, these two are not the only examples by far of a rather superficial and cursory treatment of important moments in the formation of the economic thought of Marx.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In conclusion it should be mentioned that there are also a number of grave errors in translation. On the very first page of the text (p. 9) F. Mehring is grossly misquoted. The passage in question states that for some time past the French revolution had become for Marx the means whereby he ordered his thoughts regarding the struggles and aspirations of his epoch, but the translator substitutes for the French revolution quite different references (Hegel's dialectics, Feuerbach's humanism, Bauer's 'self-consciousness', British and French socialism). If the translation is an authorised one (the author has made a number of addenda to the footnotes for the English edition) these 'liberties' are all the more regrettable.

ALEXANDER MALYSH

The Siberians

Farley Mowat

Heinemann, 314 pp., £3.20

THE AUTHOR of the best-selling *People of the Deer*, which exposed the exploitation and neglect of the Canadian Eskimos, found life gloriously different for their brothers in the Soviet Arctic. Two long journeys took Mowat to the eastern-most regions of Siberia and high in the Arctic Circle where he met the Chukchee, the cousins of the Alaskan Eskimos. From human, and often hilarious contacts with these and other 'Small Peoples' of the North, he concludes that the Soviet power saved them from the fate of their North American counterparts.

But his easy and thrilling style cannot hide the serious contribution he has made in explaining the Soviet approach to riches of Eastern Siberia, which is essentially different from the goldrush grab, while preserving the challenge that the frontier holds especially to the young.

His visit to the Permafrost Institute in Yakutsk shows how the frost which was considered the biggest enemy in developing the north has now become the best ally. 'Be nice to the Eternal Frost Queen. Keep her well covered under nice thick blankets and she will let you do anything you wish. But if you strip off her clothes, you had better watch out!' This was the message to all new planners in Siberia, Institute director Pavel Melnikov told Mowat.

He emerges as a staunch friend of the Soviet Union, convinced that its people want peace, fortified as a conservationist of natural resources, and moved that he found friendly readers of his own books in distant cold Siberia.

JOHN MOSS

Lenin in His Own Words

Ernst Fischer and Franz Marek

Allen Lane, 192 pp., £2.25

ANYONE WISHING to read Lenin in English has always turned to the range of publications of the Marx Engels Lenin Institute (Moscow), distributed here by *Lawrence & Wishart*. The choice has been between the 44 volumes of the *Collected Works*, various editions of *Selected Works*, collections of writings on particular subjects (*On Britain*, *On Revisionism*, etc.) and separate volumes and pamphlets of the better-known works. *Allen Lane* have now offered something quite different: *Lenin in His Own Words* by Ernst Fischer and Franz Marek, the Austrian Marxists whose controversial stand on a number of ideological issues is well known.

In preparing their book, the authors claim to have decided to 'let Lenin speak for himself and offer only such comments as are essential for an understanding of his words.' This claim would appear to be more nearly applicable to the Marx Engels Lenin Institute volumes than to *Lenin in His*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Own Words which, in fact, seems not entirely appropriately titled. Whilst the Soviet publications are simply translations of Lenin with editorial footnotes, *Lenin in His Own Words* is really a series of expositions by Fischer and Marek of Lenin's views on a number of issues (*The Theory of Revolution*, *The Party*, *War and Peace*, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, etc.). As they themselves put it, they 'decided to organise the book under major headings corresponding to specific sets of problems, selecting characteristic quotations to illustrate each one.' But since 'selection is itself a form of value judgement' (Max Weber) and since the 'comments essential for an understanding of Lenin's words' form an extensive matrix in which the quotations are embedded, what emerges is something which is practically as much Fischer and Marek as it is Lenin.

Many who read the book will have cause to query a number of Fischer's claims, especially the assertion that Lenin did not really believe in a policy of peaceful co-existence.

CONRAD WOOD

Wicked, Wicked Libels
edited by Michael Rubinstein
Routledge & Kegan Paul, 180 pp., £2.50

THIS IS A LIVELY and readable, but nevertheless serious and interesting, collection of essays by nine knowledgeable people, mostly lawyers, discussing the law of libel and more particularly some of its innumerable defects. They write from almost every point of view, except, to my regret, that of left-wing politicians who may find themselves sued for libel or so savagely libelled that they have to consider bringing an action themselves. (This topic will, as it happens, be dealt with in a book written by this reviewer and now in the press, entitled *The Substance of the Law*.) It is true that the editor of *Private Eye*, who might qualify as a left-wing politician, is one of the essayists, but he writes from the point of view of an editor.

The contributors, who fortunately include the editor himself, cover between them the swiftly-operating problems of the daily newspaper, those of both the publishers and the writers of books, those relating to the ill-defined right of Privacy, and a full story of the experiences of a successful plaintiff in a libel action (which latter essay should be read by all barristers and solicitors dealing with large cases whose clients' names do not end in 'Ltd').

Many readers will be struck by the great number and variety of defects and injustices of libel law with which the essays deal; but there are probably many more. The book does not claim to be comprehensive.

One very learned essay, dealing with defamation of the House of Commons and its members seen as contempt of the House, is so remote from the problems of the ordinary law of libel as to be almost out of place in the book.

It should be impossible to write more than a page of any book about libel law without making an error; but I cannot find in the book more than one or two trivial mistakes. There is one, however, that I must mention. A book of this quality should not copy the almost invariable practice of our lighter literature that anything printed in a foreign language should have at least one grammatical error in each line; but alas!, as early as page three, the French word 'loi' is treated as masculine: fortunately, this does not spoil a good joke.

The book is well got-up and printed, and my usual complaint that there is no index is less applicable here than in most books.

D. N. PRITT

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DOCTOR MARX

NEWS comes in daily of the Vietnamese people's advances, and the desperate barbarities of the US command in retaliation. Many sections of the trade union and labour movement are in action to resist US horrors as the American position becomes daily more insecure, and the voices raised in this campaign are many and strong.

The vivid impression, on reading the century-old interview in this issue with 'Dr Marx', is that his would have been a powerful voice, were he alive today, lending inspiration and encouragement in the most practical organisational ways to our Vietnamese comrades; instead his aid has long been given as the theoretician of the movement of which we are a part.

One of today's leading authorities on the economic theory developed by Marx is Dr Alexander Malysh, who heads the department specialising in the works of Marx and Engels at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Moscow. Readers will appreciate the detailed attention he brings to his work, of which we are fortunate to include a sample on page 286 written specially for *Labour Monthly*.

The struggle for Vietnam, and for trade union rights here in Britain, the subject of this month's 'Notes', require aid both theoretical and practical: some of the practical aid is that given by donors to our fund, now struggling to keep up with the increasing pace of daily events.

Nicola Seyd

£62.46

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Oliver Twist' 50p, M Morgan 25p, H Brindle 25p, Ben Ainley 50p, J D (Canada) £3, Mr and Mrs Kokos 25p, J W R Clark £3, T Crichton £1.50, W E Rounce 25p, Southend Branch £1, J Rink 25p, S Morrissy 50p, Marie Philibert 25p, P W Ladkin 50p, C T M 50p, Les Bates 25p, Mr and Mrs Guinan 25p, Blackburn Branch 15p, Oldham Branch 10p, Stella and Len Perkins 50p, A Corbett £1, E Sheldon £1, R Paul 50p, 'Pax' 35p, L'Humanité 30p, Union of Turkish Progressives in Britain £1, E Strachen Rogers £1.05, B R (USA) £2.46, J Tarver £1, 'Socialist Sailor' £2, 'Scarlet Ribbons' £5, W Laithwaite £5, A M T (for Fernando and Guilherme) 5p.

OTHER DONATIONS include: A T Lumsden 60p, E Pountney 60p, G Childs 60p, P G Husbonds £2.60 W Ramage 60p, D R Morrison 80p, W R Hunt 50p, Glyn Evans £2.60, D S Browett 50p, Mrs L Gallop £1.60, F H Walker £1, A Moffat 60p, Ben (Brighton) £2, C Grant £1.60, S D 60p, J Fasham 60p, B Strachan £2.60, W Silver £1.60, R Cull £1, S Jones £1.10, D Martin £1.60, J D S (Canada) £3, N. Rothstein 60p, J Peterson and friend £2, J Paton £1.10.

Our thanks to you all. 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD (01-346 5135)

Bankers' orders to: National Westminster Bank Ltd., Finchley Central Branch A/c No. 37564838, Code No. 60-08-20.

Published by Unity Publications (Finchley), Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.—54866

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST FREE SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

for Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD

Home and Overseas (unsealed) 1 year £2.40, 6 months £1.20

USA
1 year $7.00 (sealed $10.00)
6 months $3.50

Canada
1 year $7.50 (sealed $8.50)
6 months $3.75

Air Mail rates quoted on application

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Special Student's Concession

1 year £2.20
6 months £1.10

I am a bona fide student at

.....

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

Please make cheques, etc. payable to Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Communism and Human Values, Maurice Cornforth. Lawrence & Wishart, 72 pp., 50p.

Karl Marx, Werner Blumenberg. NLB, 196 pp., £2.50.

A Short History of the European Working Class, Wolfgang Abendroth. NLB, 204 pp., £2.50.

A History of the Irish Working Class, P. Beresford Ellis. Gollancz, 352 pp., £3.50.

My Generation, Will Paynter. Allen & Unwin, 172 pp., £3.

Wicked, Wicked Libels, edited by Michael Rubinstein. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 180 pp., £2.50.

The Green Flag, Robert Kee. Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 878 pp., £5.95.

Wars and Population, B. Urlanis. Progress Publishers (Central Books), 320 pp., £1.25.

Labour and Inequality, edited by Peter Townsend. Fabian Society, 304 pp., £3.80.

She Knew She Was Right, Ivy Litvinov, Gollancz, 247 pp., £1.90.

Community Europe Today, Roger Broad and R. J. Jarrett. Wolff, 256 pp., £1.50.

The General Strike in the North East, Anthony Mason. University of Hull, 116 pp., £2.

Apartheid: Writings on South Africa, edited by Alex La Guma. Lawrence & Wishart, 245 pp., £1.

Manley and the New Jamaica, edited by Rex Nettleford, Longmans, 394 pp., £2.75.

Outline History of the Communist International, various authors. Progress Publishers (Central Books), 564 pp., £1.50.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SPECIAL OFFER TO READERS

LABOUR MONTHLY 1971 BOUND VOLUME

Price £2.90 post free, or send £1.30 and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

UNITY PUBLICATIONS (FINCHLEY) LTD
134 BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N3 2PD

LABOUR RESEARCH

TRADE UNIONS AND THE NIRC
O. H. Parsons
DIRECT RULE AND AFTER
Betty Sinclair
HOUSING CRISIS

15p, or 17½p post free
£2.10 per annum

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8HF

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(25p a line, minimum 90p. Cash with order to: Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.)

LABOUR—CP—TU—LEFT books and pamphlets wanted. Good prices. Wants list available. **Katanka Books,** 103 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore, Middx.

SOCIALIST LIBRARIES & pamphlets bought. 01-876 7254. Hammersmith Books, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

WANTED—to increase stocks for bound volumes—any loose copies of *LM* for Mar-Aug 1939, Dec 1942, Feb & Oct 1944, Jul & Aug 1945, Jul & Sep 1949, Dec 1957, Jun 1958, Dec 1959, May 1963, Feb & Nov 1966, Jul 1967, Dec 1969 and all 1921-36, 1940-41, 1943, 1946-48, 1954, 1962 and 1964. **Particularly wanted are Mar & Aug 1922, Oct 1927 and Mar 1932.** We are grateful for any of these sent to: 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes
117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone 01-688 4328

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED